

7. 1. 5. 8

A  
VINDICATION  
O F

Mr. *GEORGE BUCHANAN*'s  
PARAPHRASE of the Book of PSALMS,  
FROM

The Objections rais'd against it by *WILLIAM BENSON*, Esq; Auditor in Exchequer, in the *Supplement and Conclusion* he has annex'd to his *Prefatory Discourse* to his new Edition of Dr. *ARTHUR JOHNSTON*'s Version of that sacred Book. In which also, upon a Comparison of the Performances of those two Poets, the Superiority is demonstrated to belong to *BUCHANAN*.

Wherein likewise several Passages of the *Original* are occasionally illustrated:

Together with some useful OBSERVATIONS concerning the LATIN Poetry and Arts of Versification.

In a LETTER to that learned GENTLEMAN.

---

By *THOMAS RUDDIMAN*, A. M.

---

*Non quivis videt immodulata poemata iudex. Hor.*  
*Hec memini, & victum frustra contendere Thyrsin:*  
*Ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis. Virg.*

---

*EDINBURGH:*  
Printed by *W. and T. RUDDIMANS.*  
*M. DCC. XLV.*



MLB 1552.68

S I R,

**I**T was a very sensible Pleasure to me, when I first heard that you had conceived so high an Opinion of the poetical Performances of our Countryman Dr. *Arthur Johnston*, particularly of his Paraphrase of the Psalms of *David*, that you had determined to publish to the World a new and handsome Edition of that Part of his Works. I was always a great Admirer of that excellent Author, and, as a Testimony thereof, I caused be printed, upwards of thirty Years ago, his *Paraphrase* of the *Song of Solomon*, which it would seem he published, together with a Version of the seven penitential and the seven consolatory *Psalms*, as a Prelude to what followed not long after, his Paraphrase of the whole of that sacred Book, which you are so much taken with. It could not therefore but be very agreeable to me, to find a Person of your Worth and Learning to fall in with my Sentiments concerning that illustrious Poet. And when afterwards I saw that you had accomplished your Design, by publishing several fair Editions of that Paraphrase, and especially that noble and splendid one in *Quarto*, a Copy whereof you were pleased to present me with; I could not but congratulate both our Author himself, and the Country that produced him, for the Pains you have so generously taken to make that Work of his better known, and received with that Esteem which it so justly merited. All this is highly commendable, and deserves the most grateful Acknowledgments not only of all *Scotsmen*, but of all who, amidst the great Decay of that kind of Learning, do still retain a true Taste and Relish of such ingenious Productions.

But, worthy *Sir*, you will forgive me to tell you, that when it afterwards appeared, that the extreme Fondness you had conceived for our Dr. *Johnston* had transported you so far, as in a separate Treatise to undervalue, in Comparison of him, all other Poets, both ancient and

modern, most of the *Augustan* Age not excepted; particularly *Ovid*, and our famous *Buchanan*; I frankly confess to you, I was not a little surprized. Taste, I know, Sir, is a very arbitrary thing; and it is almost incredible; to what Heights Men, otherwise of great Learning, have been carried, in their partial Regards for some Authors, to the Disparagement of others, of as great and sometimes greater Excellency than they. But as the Truth of things is always the same, and cannot be in the least altered by the various Opinions the most knowing Men may possibly entertain concerning them; so it is to be wish'd that Men would keep within due Bounds, and not, by their ill-grounded Prepossessions in favours of any Writer, launch out into odious and fighting Comparisons, which are oftentimes more apt to impair than to advance the Fame of him they would have so much admired. I have as high an Opinion of Dr. *Johnston*'s extraordinary Genius, as most Men have, at least as I think it ought to have; and am satisfied, that, for the Elegancy and Purity of his Diction, the Sweetness and Smoothness of his Verse, in short, all the other Ingredients that are required to the Composition of a great and masterly Poet, he was inferior to none, and superior to most of the Age he lived in. Nay I will allow farther, that, in my Judgment, he deserves the Preference to the far greater Part of those that have lived since or before him. But Dr. *Johnston* was a Man, and he, as all others, more or less, had his Blemishes and Imperfections: And therefore to represent him, as you seem to have done, as absolutely perfect; or to raise his Reputation upon the Ruins of others, who were (as I shall endeavour to shew) in many respects greater Poets than he, is a Piece of Injustice that I am sorry your over-weening Affection for him has led you into, and which none, I persuade myself, who are not tainted with the same Prejudice, can readily approve of. For my own Part, though there are several things that might more prepossess me in favours of Dr. *Johnston* than *Buchanan*, (the Freedoms I have on former Occasions taken with this last, being sufficient to vindicate me from all Suspicion of being biassed towards him;) yet,



as every equitable Judge ought to separate the Consideration of the Person from that of the Cause, and as here the Question is not concerning the moral, but the intellectual Endowments of those great Poets, I shall, with all the Impartiality and Candour I am capable of, endeavour to make it appear, that as your Commendations of Dr. *Johnston* are too highly exaggerated, so the Exceptions you make to Mr. *Buchanan* are for the most part trivial, and oftentimes without any Foundation at all. But, before I proceed, I must beg leave to premise, that as nothing, but an inviolable Regard to Truth, has engaged me to enter upon this Dispute; so I shall make it my Business to preserve all along that Decency that becometh, by avoiding all injurious and reproachful Language, which is but too common in such Controversies: And I must intreat you, that if, in the Heat of my Discourse, any thing shall escape me that hath a Tendency that Way, or may seem unworthy of the Correspondence and Friendship you have been pleased to honour me with, you will believe it to be quite beside my Intention, and the Effect of pure Inadvertency.

In the *first* place then, Sir, to speak of this Matter in general, it might have been expected, that, before you attack'd *Buchanan's* Reputation as a Poet, you should have paid greater Regard than you have done to the Opinion of others concerning him. You could not but know, and you do not dissemble it, that by the universal Consent of all his Contemporaries and since *Buchanan* has been acknowledged the most extraordinary Genius that has appeared in many Ages; that he was generally stil'd, *Poetarum sui seculi facile Princeps*; and that his greatest Enemies (of which his History and other Prose Writings had procured him not a few) durst never so much as attempt to rob him of that Glory. Now, as that Age, in which he lived, was the most fruitful of the best *Latin* Poets that had flourish'd since *Trajan's*, I had almost said *Augustus's* Time, there was but small Probability, that he, who was esteem'd the Chief of them, should be surpass'd by any that were to come after him, especially to the Degree you represent it. It seems a little too bold in

you, (pardon, Sir, the Expression) to undervalue the Authority of such great Men as *Beza*, *Grotius*, *Scriverius*, and especially the two *Scaligers*, not to mention a great many others, who give the highest Encomiums to our *Buchanan*, and were not only Persons of singular Learning, but also great Poets themselves, and of Consequence much more competent Judges than you or I, who can lay no Claim to such uncommon Abilities.

But why should we seek for other Testimonies, when we have one, who in the present Controversy is far above them all? I mean Dr. *Johnston* himself, whom you state his Rival, and will have far to have excelled him. He, in the Preface to his Paraphrase, testifies in the strongest manner, how much inferior his Performance was to that of *Buchanan*, and strains hard to find Apologies for attempting that Undertaking, after it had been done to much better Advantage by that great Author's masterly Hand. 'Tis true, in the *Conclusion* you have subjoined to your *Prefatory Discourse*, p. 46. & *seqq.* you would have your Readers believe, either "that Dr. *Johnston's* too great Modesty made him ignorant of the Perfections of his Work;" or (*which you rather insist on*) "That this Preface of his is a fine conceal'd Satyr, which Art he was obliged to make use of, because the violent Prepossession of those Times in favour of *Buchanan* would not suffer any thing to be said against him." And after you have enlarged upon this Topick in a Strain of Words which are needless to be repeated, you add, "That we shall be confirmed in this Opinion, when we reflect how improbable it is, that *Johnston* would have undertaken such a Work, as a new Translation of the whole Book of Psalms, if he had thought *Buchanan's* a good one;" with a good deal of the same kind of Reasoning. What you say of the Doctor's great Modesty is in some measure true; but, I believe he has in a poetical Way, as I shall shew he has done frequently on other Occasions, herein overacted and strain'd the Point, and carried it perhaps beyond due Bounds. But that this was design'd as a Satyr upon *Buchanan*, is what no body thought of before, and few or none can believe. The  
Argu-

Arguments you bring for it are infinitely short of being conclusive. For, pray Sir, did never Author write on a Subject, unless he thought that all that had writ on it before him had done it badly, and that none had done tolerable Justice to it before him? was it not sufficient for him to think, that others had done well, but that he could do better? And yet there is no Ground to think, that this was the Case with Dr. *Johnston*, who, though he was a great Poet himself, could not but know the superior Excellencies of another, when compared (as he owns here) with his own Performance. Did never Author write *Elegies* after *Tibullus*, *Propertius*, or *Ovid*? or *Bucolicks* or *Georgicks* after *Virgil*, who yet were sensible not only that the Labours of these great Men were good, but far beyond what themselves could produce? Were *Valerius Flaccus*, *Silius Italicus*, or *Statius*, so vain as to think that their *Epicks* were so much as equal to the glorious *Æneid*? \* Many have paraphras'd the Psalms, some before, and more since *Buchanan's* Time, and did each of these believe that his own was the best? This is hardly to be imagined. Most of them had no other View, than to exercise their poetical Genius; and some of them to do it in a different Manner. Thus, because the greater Part of *Buchanan's* Paraphrase is in the *Lyrick* Strain, *Johnston* chose that of the *Elegiack*, excepting only the 119th Psalm; which, to shew that he was capable to write in other Kinds, he has translated into as great a Variety of Verse, as there are different Stanza's in that Psalm.

But, to make it evident that Dr. *Johnston* did not think *Buchanan's* Paraphrase (as you suppose) a *bad one*, or that he had any Intention of vying with, far less of surpassing him, in that Performance, we have a real Satyr of his, (not in an ironical

A 3

nical

---

\* May we not here apply that of *Cicero*, *Orat. cap. 1. Quod si quem aut natura sua, aut illa prestantis ingenii vis forte deficiet, — teneat tamen cum cursum quem poterit. Prima enim sequentem, pulchrum est in secundis tertiiisque consistere.* And that of *Horace*, *Od. IV. 9. 5.*

*Non si priores Maonius tenet  
Sedes Homerus, Pindarica latent,  
Cæque & Alcæi minaces,  
Stesichorique graves Camæna,*



nical Way, as you pretend this his Preface is done, and not in his own Name only, but that also of the whole College of Physicians at *Paris*) wherein he at great Length exposes the fantastical Vanity of Dr. *Egleham*, who had the Confidence to contend with *Buchanan* for the Dignity of the Paraphrase of the 104th Psalm, and had the Presumption to appeal to that learn'd Body, and to expect their Decision in his favour. In this bitter Invective we have Dr. *Johnston*'s real Sentiments, not only concerning Dr. *Egleham*'s superlative Folly in making such an Attempt, but also of the high Veneration he had for *Buchanan*'s whole Paraphrase, as well as other poetical Works. Witness among others these Lines, where he says of Dr. *Egleham*:

*Te vatum, Buchanane, decus, quem suspicit orbis,  
Prisca cui assurgunt secula, dente petit:  
Ille tuis audet demens oppedere Musis,  
Quodque nequit livor perdere, rodit opus.*

And a little after,  
*Spernitur & foedis violatur charta lituris,  
Quam pinxit radio Cynthius ipse suo:  
Quodque Deo cecinit plectro meliore Camæna,  
Impia nunc audet radere lima melos.*

Are these the Words of one that had a mean Opinion of *Buchanan*, or did not think his Paraphrase a good one?

But, because it may be said, that Authority, how great soever, is not always a certain Rule to go by in Matters of this Kind; and that things ought to be measured by their own intrinsic Beauty and Value, and not by the various Suffrages or Declarations of Men concerning them: Though I always thought that the Judgment of Persons of unquestionable Capacity and Disinterestedness (as in the Case now before us) ought to have great Weight with all modest and ingenuous Minds; yet I am content to lay that aside, and proceed more particularly to enquire into the Merits of the Cause by itself, without any Regard to the Opinion of others. And here, in the *first* place, I shall undertake to prove, that what you say in your Supplement

plement, p. 2. That *Johnston's* Translation of the Psalms is in every respect greatly superior to *Buchanan's*, is so far from being true, that, on the contrary, *Buchanan's* is in every respect greatly superior to his. 2dly, I shall consider the general Objections you make against *Buchanan's* Paraphrase. And lastly, shall more particularly examine the critical Remarks you have made, in your comparing together, Verse by Verse, three Psalms done by these Authors, and of the Dedications prefix'd to their Work; and shall shew that the far greater part of them have very small or no Foundation. But before I enter upon this Disquisition, I think it proper, before-hand, to acquaint my Reader, that it is not my Design to justify, far less to commend every Word, Phrase or Sentence in *Buchanan's* Psalms. I know that he has also his Faults and Defects, some Instances of which I noted long ago, and will probably have occasion to mention some others in the Prosecution of this Subject. But this is no more than what the greatest Poets that ever were, *Homer* and *Virgil* themselves not excepted, have been liable to, and is inseparable from human Nature. All that I contend for is, that these Blemishes, whatever they are, are neither so many, nor so gross as you have represented them; and that they are amply compensated by the numberless shining Beauties that discover themselves throughout that noble Work.

---

## C H A P. I.

TO begin then with what I first propos'd, viz. to shew that *Buchanan's* Paraphrase has the Advantage of that of *Dr. Johnston's*; this I maintain it has, in these three different Respects. 1st, In the Choice of his Verse. 2dly, In his Justness in expressing the Meaning of the divine Original, and conforming his Sentiments to the Dignity and Gravity that the Subjects therein treated of do require. And 3dly, In his poetical Diction, and the Beauty and Harmoniousness of his Numbers.

## S E C T. I.

AS to the Choice of the Verse: *Buchanan* wisely considering, that the Book of Psalms is a Collection of *Prayers, Hymns* and *Spiritual Songs* of very different Kinds, and upon very different Subjects and Occasions, has accordingly made use of several Sorts of Verse, and these generally he has accommodated to the various Natures of the Psalms to be paraphras'd. I do not pretend to any Knowledge in the *Hebrew* Language, and so cannot determine what Variety there may be in the Kinds of Verse employ'd in the original Composition of these Psalms: But this I am pretty well assured of, that in the *Latin*, and, I believe, in most other Tongues, some Kinds of Verse are better adapted and more proper for some Subjects than others. Thus the *Elegiack* (which *Ovid* calls *flebile carmen*) is fittest for a mournful Theme; the *Hexameter* or *Heroick* for that of a sublime and lofty Strain; the shorter *Jambick* for Invektive, and the larger, as also the *Trochaick*, for the dramatick Kind; and so of some others. But the *Lyrick* (which takes in a great Variety, such as the *Sapphick*, the *Asclepiadean*, the *Phaleucian*, the *Alcaick*, the *Anacreontick*, &c.) are most proper for Hymns or Songs to be play'd on the Harp, (whence it had its Name) and will generally answer most Subjects, whether of the sublime, the middle or low Character. \* It was therefore (as I said) judiciously done of *Buchanan*, who, observing that most of the Psalms were compos'd to be sung to the Harp, Lute, and other such like musical Instruments, did compose the greater Part of them in *Lyricks*, as being the most proper for that Kind of Musick: Not to mention the Beauty and Pleasure that arises from that agreeable Variety. Whereas Dr. *Johnston's*

---

\* The famous *James Sadoletto*, one of the chief Restorers of Learning in *Italy*, in his Book *de pueris rectè & liberaliter instituendis*, p. 140. judiciously observes, that the Action of *Mutius Scaevola* is best told in *Jambicks*, and that of *Decius's* devoting himself to Death for his Country, is not to be describ'd in *mollibus Elegis* aut *fluentibus Dithyrambis*: sed *heroicum quatit carmen, ut dignitatem rerum par numerus consequatur.*



*ston's* Performance (the 119th Psalm only excepted) consists entirely of *Elegiacks*; which, besides their being less fit for all Kinds of Subjects, are destitute of that delightful Variety, which, by the frequent Changes of the Metre, gives as often a new Entertainment (as it were) to the Mind.

You indeed, *Prefat. Discourse, p. 57.* are at some Pains to prove that the *Elegiack* is capable of being made to suit all the various Subjects (which you reduce to these three, the *Moral*, the *Plaintive*, and the *Thanksgiving* or *Rejoycing*) treated of in the Psalms: And that *Johnston* in Effect has not only in general compass'd that End; but also that in those of the *Thanksgiving* or *heroick* Subject he has given many Instances of such an exalted *Style and Verse*, that not *Virgil himself* can excel him in *Majesty*. And you subjoin that by his having brought all the *Arts and Sublimity* of *Latin Verse* into the *Pentameter Line*, he has added a *Nobleness* of *Verse* to *Elegy*, which no *Roman Poet* ever thought of. What these *Arts and Sublimity* of *Latin Verse* are that he hath brought into the *Pentameter Line*, and what that *Nobleness* of *Verse* is which he has added to *Elegy*, and was never thought of by any *Roman Poet*, is to me absolutely mysterious and incomprehensible. The only Sense that these Words to me may seem to have is, that there is a greater Sublimity in these sacred Writings, which *Johnston* has paraphras'd, than is to be found in any *Latin Poet*. But what is that to the Purpose? If that is your Meaning, as I do not see it capable of any other, I cannot help thinking that you impose upon your Reader, by confounding the Subject with the Manner of treating it. It is not disputed, that the Psalms of *David* discover more of the *Sublime* in them, than is to be found in the best, either *Greek* or *Roman* Authors, who being ignorant of the true God, and of his adorable Attributes and Perfections, could not possibly express them in such a *divine* Manner, as those *inspired* Writers, to whom they were made known, and who had a deep and constant Impression of them on their Minds. At the same time it is true, that of these great and exalted Sentiments something must appear even in the very worst of  
Tran-

Translations; in those of *Eobannus Heflus* and *Andrew Spetbe*, as well as of *Buchanan* and *Johnston*; in those of *Sternhold* and *Hopkins*, as well as of *Tate* and *Brady*. But every body knows that it is very far from being enough, that the original Thoughts are preserv'd in a Translation, if the Language, in which they are convey'd to the Mind, do not bear a due Proportion to the Dignity of them. The Excellency of a Poem does not depend upon the Nobleness and Worth of the Subject; but on the Elegancy and Purity of the Diction, the fine Strokes of Wit and Fancy, and other natural and artificial Embellishments with which it is adorned and set off. Thus we have some admirable Pieces of Poetry upon very low and trivial Subjects, and others very dull and insipid upon those that are of the most important and serious Nature. It was therefore a good Apology that *Horace* made, why he durst not adventure to write of the noble Achievements of *Augustus* and his great Minion *Agrippa*, that his Abilities were not equal to such a Task, and that his Muse, which was only fitted for Love Sonnets or the like, did forbid him, (as he thought would otherwise be the Case) *eorum laudes culpâ deterere ingeni*.

It was therefore not very fairly done of you, (forgive the Expression) to institute a Comparison, *Pref. Disc. p. 63 & seqq.* betwixt *Ovid's* 1st Elegy of his *Trists*, and *Johnston's* Paraphrase of the 23d Psalm. The Subjects are of a quite different Nature; the one high and sublime, the other low and mean; the one expressing the tender Care Almighty God takes of his faithful Servants, the other deploring the miserable Condition of a poor Exile. To make the Advantage seem to be on *Johnston's* Side, you have given us an *English* Translation of a good Part of the one, and of the whole of the other; in the former of which, you seem in some Places not altogether to have hit the exact Meaning of the Author. But whatever is of that, the Comparison is plainly wrong stated: In which nothing is to be considered, but the Delicacy of the Poetry only; in which that trifling Poet, as you are pleased, I think very unjustly, to call him, has yet, in my Opinion, the Superiority. For in *Johnston*, the Sentiments

timents are none of his own, but all taken from the divine Original. In *Ovid*, the Thoughts are all spun out of his own most ingenious Fancy; in which he addresses this Elegy to his Book as to a Person: And keeping up all along that most beautiful *Allegory*, he represents in a lively and pathetic Manner the Miseries of his Banishment; and artfully throws in all the most moving Topics and Arguments that were proper to raise Compassion, and to procure him a Release. In this Elegy there are particularly four Couplets, which, in my Judgment, are inimitable, and beyond any thing that *Johnston*, or any Modern, ever wrote. In them he makes an Excuse for his poetical Genius's not being so bright as formerly, thus :

*Carmina proveniunt animo deducta sereno:*

*Nubila sunt subitis tempora nostra malis.*

*Carmina secessum scribentis & otia quaerunt:*

*Me mare, me venti, me fera jactat hyems.*

*Carminibus metus omnis abest: ego perditus ensem*

*Hæsurum jugulo jam puto jamque meo.*

*Hæc quoque quod facio, judex mirabitur æquus;*

*Scriptaque cum venia qualiacunque leget.*

While I am speaking of this Author, I cannot forbear mentioning another Example from him, to shew how ingenious a Poem may be writ upon a very trifling Subject. It is his *Epistle 8. lib. ii. ex Ponto*, address'd to *Maximus Cotta*, (to which I refer the Reader) upon his having sent him a Present of three Silver Coins or Medals, viz. of *Augustus*, *Tiberius* and *Livia*; wherein he has display'd such an exquisite Fluency of Expression, together with the most delicate Turns of Wit and Imagination, that the famous *Tanaquil le Fevre* could not enough admire it, and which has not perhaps its Equal in all Antiquity.

But to pass these Things, you are pleas'd, Sir, *Pref. Disc. p. 58.* to give us two other Reasons which determined *Dr. Johnston* to the *Elegiack* sort of Metre, and which, you add, are the strongest imaginable. " The first is, that  
" the



“ the Original being divided into such small Parcels, as  
 “ we see in all the Translations, there was no other sort  
 “ of Verse so proper to take in the Sense of each Verse  
 “ or Part, as the Distich of the *Elegy*.—Whereas in all  
 “ other Verse, first as to the *Heroick*, the Sense must  
 “ have run into various Lines, and so in the *Lyrick* it  
 “ must have broke into the Measure, and sometimes we  
 “ should have two or three Verses crowded together;  
 “ and at other times one single Verse run into a tedious  
 “ length. All which Inconveniencies, *add you*, are a-  
 “ voided in the sort of Verse the Doctor has chosen.”  
 The last Reason you give, and which you say is indeed  
 the *best of all*, is that this sort of Verse is the *most conve-*  
*nient for the Memory both of young Persons and old.*

As I am to be more full upon the first of these Rea-  
 sons, I shall put off the Consideration of it, till I have  
 discussed this your second Reason, which is to be done  
 in a few Words. And that is, by denying the Fact, that  
*Elegiacks* are more convenient for the Memory than *He-*  
*roicks*, *Lyricks*, or other Kinds of Verse: As to which,  
 (with all Submission) I believe, that the Truth will stand  
 on the other Side. Thus much I think is certain, that  
 nothing is more helpful to the Memory than the Conne-  
 xion that the Things to be remembred have with one an-  
 other. Now, as in *Heroicks*, and some other Kinds  
 of Metre, the Poet has a larger Scope of arranging his  
 Words; and when he is straitned, such Words or Phra-  
 ses, as he could not conveniently bring into one Line, he  
 is at Liberty to carry to another: So it cannot but be  
 much easier for him thereby to make the Connexion of the  
 Thoughts or Sentences with one another more close and  
 perceptible. Whereas in *Elegiacks*, in which the Pen-  
 tameter generally concludes the Sense, that is much  
 more difficult; especially in Translations, where the Poet  
 is tied down to the Sense of the Original, and cannot  
 fail to be much cramped and fettered in making that and  
 the Pentameter Line end together. And this I think is  
 so manifest, that I could appeal to the Experience of any  
 Man, *young or old*, whether he cannot sooner commit  
 to Memory, or longer retain in it, an equal Number of  
 Lines

Lines out of *Ovid's Epistles* or his *Metamorphoses*; or of an *Elegy* of *Propertius* or of *Virgil's Æneis*. And I doubt not, but that upon Tryal the same would be found true with respect to *Buchanan* and *Johnston's* Paraphrases.

But to return back to your first Reason, I frankly acknowledge, that I have been much surprized, and cannot enough admire *Dr. Johnston's* extraordinary Talent and Capacity, in his being able to make his *Elegiack* Distichs in most Places to comprize and take in the Meaning of the several Verses of the Original by themselves. And I heartily agree with what you cite from the learned *Mr. Hoogstratan*, who says of him on that Account, *Mirum in modum capior felici poetandi ratione, quâ breviter & sine ulla circuitione tantas res complexus est.* But then it must likewise be confess'd, that this studied Conciseness of his, chiefly occasioned by the Kind of Verse he has pitch'd on, has very often embarrassed him, and led him into three Sorts of Faults. 1<sup>st</sup>, Of making his Sense too loose and vague, and not so closely expressive of the Original, as it ought. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Of causing him sometimes lose a part of it. And 3<sup>dly</sup>, (and which is more frequent) Of obliging him to make idle or superfluous Additions to it. I might mention also a 4<sup>th</sup>, viz. A great Number of improper Words and Phrases, which he has thereby been led into; but this will more naturally come in afterwards under another Head. I will not deny, that *Buchanan* himself is guilty of all these Faults in some Instances, tho' (so far as I have been able to discover) they are not so many, nor so remarkable, as those of *Dr. Johnston*, unless it be these of the third Kind.

It is with some Reluctance that I am to take Notice of these Blemishes in *Dr. Johnston's* Performance, as being unwilling to say any thing that may detract from the Honour of that excellent Poet: But because the invidious Comparison you have stated betwixt him and *Buchanan*, and the Preference you have given to the former in all Respects, has left me no other Method of doing the latter Justice, and restoring him to the Laurel, which you have endeavoured to bereave him of, you will excuse me for entring upon the otherwise ungrateful Task,  
by

“ the Original being divided into such small Parcels, as  
 “ we see in all the Translations, there was no other sort  
 “ of Verse so proper to take in the Sense of each Verse  
 “ or Part, as the Distich of the *Elegy*.—Whereas in all  
 “ other Verse, first as to the *Heroick*, the Sense must  
 “ have run into various Lines, and so in the *Lyrick* it  
 “ must have broke into the Measure, and sometimes we  
 “ should have two or three Verses crowded together;  
 “ and at other times one single Verse run into a tedious  
 “ length. All which Inconveniencies, *add you*, are a-  
 “ voided in the sort of Verse the Doctor has chosen.”  
 The last Reason you give, and which you say is indeed  
 the *best of all*, is that this sort of Verse is the *most conve-*  
*nient for the Memory both of young Persons and old.*

As I am to be more full upon the first of these Rea-  
 sons, I shall put off the Consideration of it, till I have  
 discussed this your second Reason, which is to be done  
 in a few Words. And that is, by denying the Fact, that  
*Elegiacks* are more convenient for the Memory than *He-*  
*roicks*, *Lyricks*, or other Kinds of Verse: As to which,  
 (with all Submission) I believe, that the Truth will stand  
 on the other Side. Thus much I think is certain, that  
 nothing is more helpful to the Memory than the Conne-  
 xion that the Things to be remembred have with one an-  
 other. Now, as in *Heroicks*, and some other Kinds  
 of Metre, the Poet has a larger Scope of arranging his  
 Words; and when he is straitned, such Words or Phra-  
 ses, as he could not conveniently bring into one Line, he  
 is at Liberty to carry to another: So it cannot but be  
 much easier for him thereby to make the Connexion of the  
 Thoughts or Sentences with one another more close and  
 perceptible. Whereas in *Elegiacks*, in which the Pen-  
 tameter generally concludes the Sense, that is much  
 more difficult; especially in Translations, where the Poet  
 is tied down to the Sense of the Original, and cannot  
 fail to be much cramped and fettered in making that and  
 the Pentameter Line end together. And this I think is  
 so manifest, that I could appeal to the Experience of any  
 Man, *young or old*, whether he cannot sooner commit  
 to Memory, or longer retain in it, an equal Number of  
 Lines



Lines out of *Ovid's Epistles* or his *Metamorphoses*; or of an *Elegy* of *Propertius* or of *Virgil's Æneis*. And I doubt not, but that upon Tryal the same would be found true with respect to *Buchanan* and *Johnston's* Paraphrases.

But to return back to your first Reason, I frankly acknowledge, that I have been much surprized, and cannot enough admire *Dr. Johnston's* extraordinary Talent and Capacity, in his being able to make his *Elegiack* Distichs in most Places to comprize and take in the Meaning of the several Verses of the Original by themselves. And I heartily agree with what you cite from the learned *Mr. Hoogstratan*, who says of him on that Account, *Mirum in modum capior felici poetandi ratione, quâ breviter & sine ulla circuitione tantas res complexus est.* But then it must likewise be confest, that this studied Conciseness of his, chiefly occasioned by the Kind of Verse he has pitch'd on, has very often embarass'd him, and led him into three Sorts of Faults. 1<sup>st</sup>, Of making his Sense too loose and vague, and not so closely expressive of the Original, as it ought. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Of causing him sometimes lose a part of it. And 3<sup>dly</sup>, (and which is more frequent) Of obliging him to make idle or superfluous Additions to it. I might mention also a 4<sup>th</sup>, viz. A great Number of improper Words and Phrases, which he has thereby been led into; but this will more naturally come in afterwards under another Head. I will not deny, that *Buchanan* himself is guilty of all these Faults in some Instances, tho' (so far as I have been able to discover) they are not so many, nor so remarkable, as those of *Dr. Johnston*, unless it be these of the third Kind.

It is with some Reluctance that I am to take Notice of these Blemishes in *Dr. Johnston's* Performance, as being unwilling to say any thing that may detract from the Honour of that excellent Poet: But because the invidious Comparison you have stated betwixt him and *Buchanan*, and the Preference you have given to the former in all Respects, has left me no other Method of doing the latter Justice, and restoring him to the Laurel, which you have endeavour'd to bereave him of, you will excuse me for entring upon the otherwise ungrateful Task,  
by

by producing some Examples from Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase of the several Faults and Imperfections above mentioned. And

# I. Where the Sense of the Original is too loosely expressed.

Psal. viii. 3. — *gens oriunda luto.*] A loose Expression for the *Son of Man*: Especially if, according to some of the best Interpreters, by *Son of Man* are to be understood Princes or great Men. *Buchanan* has rendred it literally, *first homo*, and then *humani generis propago*.

ix. 6. — *de fastis oppida rasa canat.*] What a loose way is this for, *Their Memorial is perished with them*, i. e. *of these Cities*? What! were the Names of Cities set up in publick Registers, or engraven on Tables of Brass or Marble, to keep up the Remembrance of them? and when they were destroy'd, were these Registers cancell'd? *Buchanan* here is plain.

xviii. 46. — *aternum vivere posse dedit.*] This extremely loose, and, strictly speaking, not true. *Orig.* has only, *The God of my Salvation*, i. e. *The God that hath prospered me, and saved me from mine Enemies*; nothing being insinuated of his being made to live long, far less for ever. *Buchanan* clear.

xxxiii. 4. *Verbaque sunt ipsa candidiora nive*] This seems too general a way of expressing *The Word of the Lord is right*.

xxxix. 6. *Horret iter tenebris*] This is a very vague Translation of *Surely every Man walketh in a vain Shew*. Besides, it is not told whose *iter* this is. In the Verses immediately preceeding, the *Psalmist* is speaking of himself, and of the Shortness and Uncertainty of his own Life. But here he must be speaking of another, as appears by the Words *Heredem nescit avarus opum*. Good Language would have required that this *other* should have been mentioned, at least hinted at, which is not done here.

Ver. 11. *Ah! quam mortales lubrica turba sumus!*] This is not only a loose, but a low way of expressing *Surely every Man is Vanity*.

xli. 1. *O felix inopem trutinâ qui pensitat aequâ.*] This is very general, and hardly just for, *Blessed is he that considereth the poor*, i. e. pities and relieves him. Buchanan clear, *Beatus ille qui misertus pauperis, Fert rebus in duris opem.*

xliv. 4. *Intremet & gemini terra sub axe poli.*] Too loose and remote from *Orig.* *Thy Right Hand shall teach thee terrible things.* Unless in a spiritual Sense, and applied to our B. Saviour, it is too much to say, *That the whole World from Pole to Pole should tremble before him.* I might likewise observe, that this Line is added to make up the *Elegiack*, the *Hexameter* having sufficiently answered that Part of the Text: *Sic tua percussæ discent miracula gentes.* But Buchanan is yet more close: — *Tua dextera factis Clara per ignotas fundet miracula terras.*

xlvi. 3. — *Gemino sub vertice cæli.*] i. e. *ab utroque polo*, says the *Annotator*; but that is not true, nor insinuated in the Text, which has only *People* and *Nations*. Buchanan here is just, *Qui bellicosa compulit Parere nobis opida, &c.*

l. 15. — *Tu mea facta refer.*] Too general for, *Thou shalt glorify me.* Buchanan is full: *Grates ut acceptâ salutare Letus agas, Dominumque laudes.*

li. 1. *Adspiret famulo mollior aura tuo.*] Too loose a Phrase for *Have Mercy upon me.* And I doubt if it is proper for *David* to call himself God's Servant, when he lay under the Guilt of such heinous Transgressions as *Adultery* and *Murder*.

ver. 13. — *Et Solymæ figet in æde larem.*] There is very little in *Orig.* to countenance this Paraphrase; for what Connexion is there of that with *And Sinners shall be converted unto thee?* Besides, what is the Meaning of *Solymæ figet in æde larem?* Were these converted Sinners to take up their constant Residence in the Temple (which by theby was not then built) at *Jerusalem?* That belonged to the *Priests* and *Levites* only, and not to them always. Buchanan is perfectly right here, *Tum meo exemplo, &c.*

lvii. 7. *Obsequiosa mihi mens est.*] A loose and affected Way of speaking for *My Heart is fixed*, i. e. *I am fully resolved*



resolved to serve thee, or to pay the Vows which I have made in my Distress.

lix. 5. — *Belli pacisque sequester.*] A loose Phrase for Lord God of Hosts: Besides that the Word *sequester* is hardly ever applied to War. See *Faber's Lexicon*.

lxiv. 4. — *Lethifero recludit pectora ferro.*] This too much: For by the Words of *Orig.* They shoot at me, no more is meant, but that they utter Calumnies and Slanders against me to *Saul*. So *Dr. Patrick*: Or, according to *Dr. Wells*, who seek to destroy me, applying it to the Time of *Abshalom's* Rebellion. But even that imports only that they set about to destroy him, not that they actually did it, unless in their Hearts. *Buchanan* right.

Ver. 8. *Ipsa bibet gens hæc sua toxica*] Too loose and flaunting for, They shall make their own Tongue to fall upon themselves. *Buchanan*, a Part of whose Words *Johnston* has borrowed, is more exact: *Auctori exitium cum videant sue Dirum immittere lingua Viroscæ mala toxica.*

lxvi. 12. *Nec vada, nec flammæ deerant.*] Too loose for, We past through Fire and through Water. *Buch.* right.

lxvii. 6. *Omnis dabit omnia tellus.*] This too much for, Then shall the Earth yield her Increase. 'Tis true, *Virgil*, from whom he has borrowed the Phrase, *Ecl. iv. 39.* has *Omnis feret omnia tellus*, and *Ovid, Met. I. 102.* *Per se dabat omnia tellus*: But they are speaking of the Golden Age, 'so much celebrated by the ancient Poets; whereas no such thing is intended here, but only that the Earth should produce its Fruits in great Abundance, and not that all kinds of Earth should produce all kinds of Fruits. Common Experience shews the contrary, according to that of the same *Virg. Geo. I. 54.* *Hic segetes, illic veniunt felicius uvæ, &c.*

lxxvi. 10. *Te canet hostili nuper quæ ferbuit ira Turba ferox.*] This is very loose for, The Wrath of Man shall praise thee: For there is a Difference between The Wrath of Man shall praise thee, and A Company of wrathful Men shall praise thee; for these were so far from any Intention of praising God, that, on the contrary, they exercised their Rage against his People. But their Wrath shall praise him, i. e. (as all Interpreters expound the Place) will present

sent him with a greater Opportunity to glorify himself, as it has now done, by suppressing the Fury of the Assyrians against Jerusalem; For it was upon that Occasion, that Dr. Patrick and Wells think this Psalm was written. Buchanan expresses it, *That the Punishment of wicked Men gave occasion to the Good to praise God.*

lxxx. 15. ——— *cure Sit tibi votivo vinea fæta mero.*] I know not well what is to be understood by this *votivo mero*. The Annotator explains it, *vino tibi devoto*. But this seems not only loose, but very remote from Orig. *The Branch which thou madest strong for thyself, i. e. and especially our King [Hezekiah] whom thou hast endued with Zeal for thy Service.* So Patrick and Wells. Hammond explains it *the Temple*. Buchanan here is close and literal.

lxxxv. 4. *Da reduces tua castra sequi.*] Grant that we may return and follow thy Camp. This is a loose Way of expressing, *Turn us, O God, i. e. (says Dr. Patrick) Com- pleat our Deliverance. Turn us (says Dr. Wells) from all Sin and Disobedience to thee.* Buchanan not amiss, *Respice placatus facilisque, &c.*

12. *Pandet & astriferi rerum Pater horræa cæli.*] Too bold for, *The Lord will give that which is good.* Had it been spoken of the *Manna*, it had been proper enough; but not so here, where only a plentiful Increase of the Fruits of the Earth is signified. Johnston has exaggerated what is said by Buchanan, *Comes Astræe bona copia cælo appluet, i. e. è cælo tanquam pluvia descendet.* Jul.

xc. 17. *Nos, Pater, illustra radiis quibus ipse coruscas.*] i. e. *Illuminate us with those Rays with which thou art resplendently glorious thyself.* A Prayer (I think) not proper to be offered to God, and too loose for, *Let the Beauty of the Lord be upon us, i. e. Let us by thy special Favour inherit that pleasant Land, which thou hast promised to give us.* Buchanan more just, *Fac tuæ semper bonitatis ut nos Splendor illustret.*

xcv. 1. *Et pede pulset humum.*] Nothing of dancing, which this signifies in Orig. but *Let us make a joyful Noise, i. e. Let us lift up our Voices in his Praises.* *Quo nitimur omnes, ver. preced.* is but a loose Way of expressing *The God of our Salvation.* Buchanan just.

xcviii. 9. *Stat Deus ante fores, cives ut censeat orbis.*] This very loose for, *He cometh to judge the Earth.* What are these *fores*? Buchanan very just.

c. 3. — *nemo—faber ipse sui est.*] A flaunting Expression, and not grave enough for, *We did not make ourselves.* Buchanan, *Non enim nos finximus ipsi.*

cv. 19. — *mille probata modis.*] This too much for *The Word of the Lord tried him*; for it is so far from being true, that the Word of the Lord tried him *a thousand Ways*, that here one Trial only, or two at most, is signified, viz. the Interpretation of the chief Butler and Baker their Dreams. See *Gen.* xli.

cix. 6. — *auctori scelerum—obijce prædam.*] An odd Version this of, *Set thou a wicked Man over him*, i. e. *Appoint thou a wicked Man to be his Judge.* See *Patrick* and *Wells.*

7. *Dumque rogat veniam, se probet esse reum.*] This a loose Turn to these Words, *Let his Prayers become Sin*, i. e. *Let his Petition be made an Aggravation of his Sin*: Or, as Buchanan has well paraphras'd it, *Oratione iudices exasperet*, i. e. *Let his Prayers more incense his Judges, than if he had held his Peace.*

17. *Attulit hic hominum nulli, &c.*] This Distich loose and flaunting for, *He delighted not in blessing, &c.* for who would take *Salve* and *Ave* for *Blessing* and *Cursing.*

cxii. 2. *Sceptra geret soboles solis contermina metis.*] This is beyond all Bounds for, *His Seed shall be mighty upon the Earth*, i. e. *The Posterity of the good Man shall be powerful and prosperous, even in this World*: But that is not, that they shall be *Kings* and *Princes*; far less, that their Dominion shall be extended to the uttermost Parts of the Earth. Buchanan right, *Latè per urbes divites potentiam Ejus propago proferet.*

3. *Quæ colet Eois splendebunt atria gemmis.*] This is likewise carried too far, for, *Wealth and Riches shall be in his House.* That House surely must be immensely magnificent, where the Entry or outer Courts of it are adorned with oriental Pearl. Buchanan right.

cxvi. 3. — *mæror pectoris hospes erat.*] Sorrow was  
the



*the Guest of my Breast or Heart.* An affected Phrase for;  
*I found Trouble and Sorrow.*

10. — *docuit libera verba loqui.*] Taught me to speak  
*free Words.* This very loose for, *Therefore have I spoken,*  
 i. e. *Therefore did I declare to others, that I doubted not*  
*that God would deliver me.* See *Patrick and Wells.*

cxxi. ult. *Sive malis domi vivere, sive foris.*] This a  
 low Line at best, and besides very loose to express, *Thy*  
*going out and thy coming in;* i. e. *in all thy Affairs;* whe-  
*ther within doors or abroad.* I see no manner of Use for  
*malis* here. *Buchanan* full and clear.

cxxvi. 6. *Horrea dum cernit vacuari ditia.*] Orig. Bear-  
*ing precious Seed:* Nothing of *horrea ditia* here intimat-  
 ed, nor for ought appears intended. *Buchanan* here right.  
 But his four last Lines seem quite superfluous; at least  
 there is nothing for them in *Orig.*

cxxvii. 2. *Nec dape te satiat labor ærumnosus: at ista*  
*Satque superque piis sufficit ipsa quies.*] This is a very loose  
 Translation of; *To eat the Bread of Sorrows* [or *Careful-*  
*ness:*] for so giveth he his beloved Sleep. But the last Part  
 especially, *at ista satque superque, &c.* is to me almost un-  
 intelligible, *Rest itself supplies Men with these things in*  
*great Abundance.* 1st; The *ista* is somewhat obscure.  
 2dly, Did ever *Rest* or *Sleep* of itself provide Men with e-  
 ven the Necessaries of Life? 3dly, What Connexion  
 is there here between these Words, and; *So he giveth his*  
*beloved Sleep?* i. e. *He giveth to good Men, who depend*  
*on him; all things fit for them, without their breaking their*  
*Sleep with Labour and Care, as others do.* *Buchanan* right  
 and clear.

cxxxviii. 2. — *Et dabo thura focis.*] A little loose for;  
*I will praise thy Name.* There is nothing of *Incense* in  
*Orig.* *Buchanan* more close.

ibid. *Orbis in extremi [metis] nobile nomen habes.*] *Thou*  
*hast a glorious Name in the utmost Limits of the World:*  
 This very loose for, *Thou hast magnified thy Word above all*  
*thy Name;* i. e. *Thou hast manifested thy Power and Good-*  
*ness to me in nothing so much, as in punctually fulfilling thy*  
*Promise, notwithstanding all the Opposition which was made*  
*to it.* *Patrick.* *Buchanan* here is also somewhat loose;

but *Johnston's orbis extremi metis* exceeds.

cxxxix. 20. — *in te genuinum stringit.*] This (from *Persius*) is both loose and low.

ibid. *Nil profecturo ore.*] This also very loose for, *Take thy Name in vain*, i. e. without Regard to thy sovereign Majesty and Omniscience. Buchanan short but distinct, — *qui scelesti nomini Et numini illudunt tuo.*

cxlv. 17. *Et supera quicquid prodit ab arce pium.*] *Whatever comes from Heaven is pious.* This is very loose for, *The Lord is holy in all his Ways*, i. e. *He is kind and merciful in all his Dealings toward us.* Buchanan much better, *Quicquid agis justè sanctèque agis*, which comprehends also the former Part of the Verse: *He is righteous in all his Works.*

There are some more Examples of this Kind, which, for avoiding Tedioufness, I have past over; and there are not a few others, which will also come under the Class of Improproprieties, and which I have reserved to be taken notice of in another Place. I proceed therefore now to the second Sort of Faults Dr. *Johnston* has been led into, chiefly by his Paraphrase being done in *Elegiacks*, and that is,

## II. Where some Part of the Original is lost.

xxvi. 6. *Ergo ubi me purâ lustravi fluminis undâ.*] Orig. *I will wash my Hands in Innocency.* Here the Words *in Innocency*, i. e. *in testimony of my Innocency*, (which is very emphatick) is quite omitted. Buchanan right: *Sed mente pravi non sibi consciâ.*

xxxiii. 3. — *Domino pange perenne melos.*] Orig. *Play skilfully with a loud Noise.* The Word *skilfully*, (which is not without its own Significancy) is here neglected, and *perenne* dully put in its Place. Buchanan right: *Hic artem manus approbet.*

xxxv. 13. *Et caput obstipum, &c.*] Here the Words, *And my Prayer returned into my own Bosom*, which Dr. *Patrick* explains, *That he wish'd not better to his own Heart than he did to them*; but Dr. *Wells* (I think) better, *My*

*My Prayer was returned with Ingratitude* : I say, these Words, in whatever Sense they are to be taken, are quite omitted both by *Buchanan* and *Johnston*.

xl.iii. 5. *Nec Deus, hunc præter, quam sequar, alter erit.*] *Orig.* Who is the Health of my Countenance, and my God. Here, *Who is the Health of my Countenance* is quite overlooked. *Buchanan* takes it in thus, *Quum saluus patriæ reddar amabili*.

lv. 17. *Audiet ille preces, quas fundam, lucida cœli Limina, vel medias sole tenente vias.*] *Orig.* is, *Evening and Morning, and at Noon, will I pray, &c.* *Johnston* seems here to have omitted the *Evening*, unless *limina cœli* is to stand for both *Morning* and *Evening*. *Buchanan* has omitted *Noon*, which he should not have done. See *Dan.* vi. 10. where the *three Hours of Prayer* are mentioned as customary among the *Jews*.

cxlii. 6. *Despicit hic cœli, cœlo sublimior, arces.*] *Orig.* *Humbleth himself to behold.* Here the Phrase *humbleth himself* is neglected both by *Buchanan* and *Johnston*. And yet the Sense of it is so sublime, as well as emphatical, that it hath furnished Matter for an excellent Sermon to *Dr. Valentine Nalson*, which he has entituled, *Of the Humility of God*.

cxxiv. 1. *Gens sacra jam dicat.*] This is emphatically repeated in *Orig.* and by *Buchanan*, but omitted by *Johnston*.

I now proceed to the third Inconvenience *Dr. Johnston* has been brought into, by his using the *Elegiack* kind of Verse.

### III. *Where superfluous Additions are made to the Original.*

v. 1. *Magne parens, Dominum tellus quem suspicit.*] The last Part of this is not in *Orig.*

viii. 8. *Quique sub hac gaudet findere piscis aquas.*] *Sub hac* seems an idle Addition to fill up the Verse. The Annotator has not thought fit, in his Interpretation, to let us know what this *hac* refers to, whether to *via* or *volucris*, that go before. I suppose our Author meant the



latter, but in my Opinion not very fitly; for most *Fowls* flee over Land, and few comparatively over Sea. But perhaps by *aquas* he meant those of *Rivers* and *Lakes*; but the *Orig.* names them twice *Fish of the Sea*.

xiii. 3. *Luce retrospectans da propiore frui.*] There is no other Occasion for this Verse, but to fill up the *Elegiack*. The *Orig.* has only, *Lighten mine Eyes*, and that is expressed in the Words following, *Optatum mox redde jubar*.

xvii. 9. *Hic gazas, jugulum per scelus ille petit.*] There is nothing of this in *Orig.* but only that *his Enemies had compass'd him about*. 'Tis true, they are called *deadly Enemies*; but that is contained in *crudelis hostis*, which goes before.

xxiii. ult. *Hic ubi perpetuo gaudia latus agam.*] Unless it be *perpetuo*, all this Verse is an Addition to the Text, If it had been proper to add any thing, it should rather have been something that should signify, that the Psalmist would be careful to serve God and praise him for his wonderful Love towards him. See *Patrick* and *Wells*.

xxxi. 1. *Arx mea, — equi arbiter, alme parens.*] The two first brought in to make up the Verse. *Orig.* has only *O Lord*. *Buchanan*, whose Paraphrase is generally more diffuse, has here no more but *Rerum creator optime*,

xxxiv. 8. — *Dominum qui suspicit unum, Præter & hunc nullum quem veneretur habet.*] This is upon the Matter repeating the same thing twice, neither of which directly answer *Orig.* *Blessed is the Man who trusteth in him*. *Buchanan* much better, — *beati spes in illo qui suas Omnes opeſque collocant*.

xlii. 1. *Sic mea vitali satiari numinis unda Mens avet, & Domini flagrat amore jui.*] For So panteth my Soul after thee, O God. Besides the disagreeable Phrase, *satiari unda numinis*, the first or last of these Sentences seems superfluous.

4. *Inter & ærumnas est mihi dulce queri.*] Besides the Impropropriety (as I take it) of *dulce queri*, this is saying nothing but what is said before, *In lacrymas totus miser & suspiria solvor*. Here likewise we have (what Mr. Benson so much complains of in *Buchanan*) an *Anticlimax*: For *Complaining* is less than *to be dissolved wholly into Tears and Sighs*.

l. i. — *cui servit purpura regum.*] This is either a superfluous Addition, or pretty remote from *Orig.* which has only, *The mighty God, even the Lord.* However, in this he has imitated *Buchanan*, who has, *Qui frenat — Superba regum colla minacium.*

liii. 4. *Glubere qui populum non metuere meum.*] This seems a superfluous Addition, when all that is in the *Orig.* *Who eat up my People as they eat Bread,* is express in the following Verse, *Ceu dape dilectæ pascuntur sanguine gentis.* *Buchanan* is more close, — *gens — Quæ panis instar devorant plebem meam.*

lvi. 8. *Tu tabulis gemitus, lacrymas tu colligis urnâ.*] Besides that I do not like *Colligis gemitus meos in tabulis*, there is nothing to answer it in *Orig.* (which is *Thou tellest my Wandrings: put my Tears into thy Bottle: are they not in thy Book?*) the first and (I may say) the last Clause are contained in the Verse following, *Et numeras nostræ tædia longa fugæ.* *Buchanan* here comes close up to the Text, *Meæ labores tu numeras fugæ, Urnâ repostas tu lacrymas meas Servas, apud te certa constat Usque mei ratio doloris.*

lix. 15. *Dum redeat terris lux nova.*] There is nothing of this in *Orig.*

lxiii. 1. *Te sitio, te membra fame tabentia poscunt, Hic ubi nec seges est, unda nec apta siti.*] There is nothing of *Hunger*, or of *Want of Corn* in *Orig.* (which is *in a dry and thirsty Land*, and signifies no more but a Place where he had no Water to refresh him.) *Buchanan* here just to the Text.

lxviii. 7. *Invia tu, memini, per loca ductor eras.*] *Memini* here is not only superfluous, but improper: For how could *David* remember what happened some hundreds of Years before he was born?

9. — *ditasti rura quotannis.*] I know not what *quotannis* here is good for. *Orig.* *Thou didst send a plentiful Rain, whereby thou didst confirm, [or strengthen] thine Inheritance, when it was weary.* If this (as *Dr. Wells* will have it) is to be applied to the *Manna* that was rain'd from Heaven, then the *ditasti rura* is out of purpose; for that can hardly signify any thing else but *making the Earth*

fruitful (not to mention that the *Manna* fell every Day, except the Sabbath, for forty Years together, and so *quotidie* or *quotidie* had been more proper.) Or if, with some others, are to be understood the *Quails*, or literally some *Showers of Rain* in the *Wilderness*; as the first fell out but once, and the second was not stated and anniversary, *quotannis* cannot well be applied to them. *Buchanan* here right.

13. — *quam jaculis ocys ala rapit.*] This added to fill up the Verse.

lxxi. 18. *Dum tegar ingesta lumine cassas humo.*] This has but little Foundation in *Orig.* which is, *When I am old and gray-headed forsake me not*; and not, *Do not forsake me till I am dead.* *Buchanan* clear.

lxxv. 8. *Nec Notus aut Boreas, &c.*] Here, as well as in *Buchanan*, all the four Quarters of the World are mentioned, whereas the *North* is omitted in *Orig.* and that perhaps not without Design, to signify that *Promotion cometh neither from the East, nor from the West, nor from the South*, but did really come from the *North*, i. e. from *God*, whose Temple stood to the *North* of *Jerusalem*. See *Psalms* xlviii. 2. as also *Isa.* xiv. 13.

lxxxvi. 6. *Ne pereat pelagi spes mea mersa vadis.*] There is nothing of this in *Orig.*

4. — *dum cingunt undique Syrtes.*] I find nothing of this in *Orig.* besides I do not love the *Syrtes*.

xcv. 8. — *vetita quos sitis ussit aqua?*] Why *vetita*? There is nothing of that in *Orig.* nor indeed of their thirsting for Water, but in general, *In the Provocation, and as in the Day of Temptation in the Wilderness.* Interpreters indeed agree that it is imply'd, but then it is not signify'd, that Water was forbidden them; for, on the contrary, it was immediately given them: And their Sin was not in desiring to have it, for that being natural was unavoidable; but their Fault was, in their not waiting patiently till God should give it them, and their faithless and seditious murmuring against *Moses*, and even *God* himself, for the Want of it.

cv. 13. — *populis, heu! praeda profanis Cessit.*] This not in the Text, nor true. What is there said is spoken of



of *Abraham* and *Isaac*, who, tho' they several times changed their Habitations, yet never were subject to, far less made Slaves or Captives by any King or People.

cx. 1. — *Nate.*] Not in *Orig.* How far allowable?

cxii. 9. — *incertas nimium, nimiumque fugaces* — *opes.*] *Buchanan* much to the same Purpose: But both without Book.

cxixvi. 25. — *de sedibus altis.*] *i. e.* from Heaven. Not in the Text, and perhaps not very proper.

cxixvii. 2. — *servili non temeranda manu.*] } Not in

7. — *montanis mox habitanda feris.*] } *Orig.*

8. — *quibus astra laceffis.*] Without Book, and too high an *Hyperbole*.

6. — *lingua* — *fidere tacta.*] Without the Text, and borrowed, not very pertinently, from that of *Martial*, *Epig.* xi. 86. *Sidere percussa est subito tibi, Zoile, lingua.*

cxlvii. 20. *Sole quibus fas est sideribusque frui.*] An idle Addition, of no other Use but to fill up the *Elegiack*.

\* There are several other Additions of this Kind, which I pass over; Neither would I have mentioned so many of these as I have done, were it not, Sir, that you so grievously complain of *Buchanan* on that Score. By the by, I would not have you, or my Readers, to understand that I hereby condemn all such Additions. So far from it, that I know that oftentimes they are unavoidable, especially in Verse Translations, and that frequently they serve to illustrate and adorn the Subject: Tho' I am afraid a great many of those I have remarked will be found not to answer that Purpose.

## S E C T. II.

BUt it is now high time that I should go forward to the second *Branch* of this Part of my Undertaking, which was to shew that *Buchanan's* Paraphrase has the Advantage of *Dr. Johnston's*, with respect to the *Justness* and *Propriety*, which the former has above the latter, in expressing the *Meaning of the Original*, and conforming his Sentiments to  
the

*the Dignity and Gravity which the Subjects therein treated of do require.*

And here I might, without further, appeal to the Judgment of all unprejudiced Persons, who have been, or will be, at the Pains to compare these two Performances with one another, whether they do not observe through the whole a greater *Dignity, Gravity*, and, I may add, *Sublimity and Majesty of Expression*, and of consequence a nearer Conformity of Sentiment to the divine Original, in Mr. *Buchanan's* Paraphrase than that of Dr. *Johnston*. This to myself at least is so conspicuous, that on what Side soever the Preference may ly in other Respects, yet in this *Buchanan* has vastly surpass'd Dr. *Johnston*; the one having seldom swerv'd from this necessary Rule, and the other having fail'd in it in a great Number of Instances. And that I may not seem to advance this without Ground, I take the Freedom to lay before you the following Examples: Which, for Method's sake, I shall distinguish into the three following Kinds. 1<sup>st</sup>, Of Improproprieties arising from Allusions to poetical Fables, or Customs practis'd among *Greek, Roman*, or other *Heathenish Nations*; which are supposed not to be known to, at least to be us'd by the Worshippers of the true God. 2<sup>dly</sup>, Of Improproprieties of Words and Phrases, which have a Levity in them, and fall short of that Regard that ought to be had to the Majesty of the Great GOD, of whom they are spoken, or to whom they are address'd. 3<sup>dly</sup>, Of Improproprieties of a more particular Nature, which cannot well be reduced to the other two Heads. To go on in Order, I begin with the first.

### *I. Of Improproprieties of Words or Phrases arising from an Allusion to poetical Fables, or the Customs of Heathenish Nations.*

IN this it must be confess'd, that most *Latin* and even other Poets, since the Restoration of Learning in *Europe*,  
by

by their frequent reading, and as it were conversing with these excellent *Greek* and *Roman* Authors, have been too much led, even in sacred Poems, to imitate their Manner, and to fall in with the poetical *Fictions*, and *Allusions* to the Customs of those People, with which they had so beautifully embellished their Works. I will not take upon me altogether to condemn this Practice, which *Buchanan* himself has not been able, it would seem, to keep himself entirely free of. Thus much is certain, that a great many, not only pious, but also learned Men, have taken Offence at it †. Nay, some have carried the Matter yet higher, (with whom you seem a little to chime in, in the Introduction of your *Pref. Disc.*) by advising that all these Heathenish Authors should be entirely banished the Schools. Tho' I can by no means subscribe to this last Opinion, as well foreseeing that if these great Masters of Antiquity are to be discarded, all polite Learning must go along, and Ignorance and Barbarity succeed in its Place: Yet I cannot but at the same time wish, that our modern Poets, especially in sacred Subjects, had been more cautious and reserved in their Allusions to the Religion and Manners of these ancient Times. And if it may seem somewhat profane in a *Christian* to use such Words and Phrases as are not suitable to his Profession and Faith; it must be yet more incongruous to put them into the Mouth of an *Israelite*, who is to be supposed utterly a Stranger to such ways of speaking \*. And that

Dr.

---

† See Mr. Balzac's Dissertation or Letter to Mr. Huygens, wherein he finds Fault with *Dan. Heinsius's* Tragedy, intitled *Herodes infanticida*, upon that Account. And tho' the same *Heinsius* has said a great deal in Vindication of himself, in a Treatise writ on purpose by way of Epistle, *quâ respondetur dissertationi D. Balzaci. Lugd. Bat. 1636, 8vo*; yet I am almost convinc'd, that such a Practice is unjustifiable in a *Christian*, both by the thing itself, and the weighty Reasons brought against it by the famous *Salmasius*, in his *Epistola ad Agid. Menagium super Herode infanticida viri celeberrimi Tragœdia & censura Balzaci, Amst. 1656, 4to*. As also by Mr. Rollin, in his excellent Book of the Study of the *Belles Lettres*, and many others.

\* The Rev. Charles Lamotte, in his ingenious *Essay upon Poetry and Painting*, p. 109. justly, in my Opinion, blames the great *Milton* himself, for invoking a *Muse* in the Beginning of his Poem, when after

he



Dr. *Johnston* has been faulty in this Respect, take the Examples following.

xvii. 14. *Quas tibi de cornu divite fundit humus.*]

lxv. 12. — *pleno copia cornu.*]

cxxviii. 5. — *è cornu divite fundet opes.*]

cxxxii. 15. — *Hic bona de pleno fundetur copia cornu.*]

These in Allusion to the poetical Fable of the *Amalthean Horn*, or *Horn of Plenty*.

lxviii. 4. — *infandis Lerna referta malis.*]

xix. 13. — *hydris Mille repurgatis.*]

cxxviii. 7. *Me licet infestent fluctus & Lerna malorum.*]

These Metaphors taken from the Fable of the Lake *Lerna*, where the Serpent *Hydra* with seven Heads, which *Hercules* cut off, is feigned to have lived.

lxvi. 4. — *occiduis subdita terra rotis.*]

lxxxviii. 13. *Orta dies croceis dum fugat astra rotis.*]

ciii. 12. *Ceruleo fessas cum lavit amne rotas.*]

cxix. 44. — *solem celeres dum rapiunt quadrigæ.*]

cxxxvi. 9. *Astrorum Lunæque rotis.*]

cxlviii. 3. — *sidera vecta rotis.*]

13. — *fidereisque rotis.*]

These in Allusion to the idolatrous Notions of the *Gentile World*, who attributed *Chariots* to the *Sun*, *Moon*, *Stars*, *Morning* and *Night*.

xxi. 1. *Clamabit quoties, te duce, victor Io!*]

xxxiii. 3. — *Io! ter voce canorâ Ingeminans.*]

xl. 16. — *voce canorâ Dicat Io!*]

lxvii. 4. *Dicat, Io! populus.*]

xcv. 1. — *Io! geminans.*]

xcvii. 1. — *ter Io! dic ultima tellus.*]

cxix. 74. *Ingeminabit Io!*]

cxxxii. 9. — *gens sacra cantet Io!*] †

These in Allusion to the Acclamations of the People  
to

---

he addresses the *Holy Ghost* as his *Muse*: As he does afterwards, for mentioning the Marriage of *Jupiter* and *Juno*, the Rape of *Proserpine*, and for his bringing many Allusions and Similes, that have a Relation to the Gods of the Heathens, as of *Janus*, *Mercury*, &c. The same Author condemns *Sanazarius* and *Vida* for the same Fault.

† *Buchanan*, much to the same Purpose, has, *Pf. lxxviii. 4. tibi rerum Sanctæ parens paena canet*: Which I am not very fond of.

to the Victors at the *Olympian* and other *Grecian* Games, or to the *Roman* Generals upon their *Triumphs* and *Ovations*.

ix. 3. — *hic murus abeneus.*]

xxv. 22. — *tu murus abeneus esto.*]

xlvi. 1. — *abenea turris.*]

lix. 17. — *abenea turris.*]

I doubt if ever there were Walls or Towers of Brass, but that

which the Poets feign were made for *Danae*. However, as the Phrase is become common, not only with Poets, but others, I pass it.

xiv. 3. — *in præceptis omnes lymphaticus error Egerat.*] This *lymphaticus error* is borrowed from a *Heathenish* Fancy or Notion, whereby it was thought that if one saw a *Nymph* or *Spectre* in the Water, he was immediately seiz'd with Madness.

xvi. 4. — *aves Absit ut offendant nomina læva meas.*] where the *nomina læva* seems to have been suggested to our Author by *Virgil's Numina læva*. But it seems not proper in *David* to call these *Deities*, or their *Names*, *læva*, i. e. *hurtful* or *mischievous*, who knew they were all pure *Figments* and *nothing*.

xxi. 2. *Vana nec alipedes verba tulere Noti.*] Here, in Imitation of the fabulous Mythology of the Ancients, he gives not only Wings but Feet to the Winds †. By which also he seems to make Gods of them, as they did. And the same may be said of

xxx. 1. — *velasti tempora lauro.*] This, besides that it is an Allusion to a *Roman* Custom of Soldiers being crowned with Laurel Wreaths after a Victory, (which I believe was not used by the *Israelites*) is very remote from *Orig. Thou hast lifted me up*, i. e. as Interpreters explain it, *hast drawn me up out of that Depth of Misery into which I was plunged*. See *Dr. Patrick. Buchanan* accordingly has, *De faucibus lethi imminentis incolumis* \*.

xliv. 12.

† I know that in *Pf. civ.* it is said, that God walks on the Wings of the Wind; by which is signified their swift Motion in the Air, like that of Fowls: But no where do we find Feet attributed to them. *Buchanan* also, *Pf. lxxviii. 27.* gives them Wings; but not Feet to which these were fastned.

\* The same however has, *Pf. cviii. 13.* ---- *visceri decorati tempora lauro.*

xliv. 12. — *subjicis hastæ captivos.*] An Allusion to the Roman Custom of selling Slaves.

xlix. 17. *Dives ad infernas pompa sequetur aquas.*] An Allusion to the poetical Fictions concerning the Rivers in Hell, Cocytus, Acheron and Phlegeton: Which the Psalmist is not to be suppos'd to have any Notion of.

li. 7. — *sacro me flumine lustra.*] Why *sacro*? I am afraid he is alluding to the Notion of the Heathen Poets, with whom all Rivers were sacred, as having each their particular Deities. Thus,

cxiv. 3. — *sacra Jordanis aqua.*]

5. — *sacri fluminis unda.*]

lxxii. 3. — *palma redimita capillos Pax aderit*] Where Hair adorned with a Wreath of Palm-tree Leaves, are attributed to Peace as a Goddess. I know the Holy Scriptures speak of Peace, Mercy, Justice, &c. as of Persons. But I no where find them distinguished by their peculiar Habits.

lxxviii. 13. — *cumulataque murmure sacro Æquora.*] Here the Epithet *sacro* seems to be used for the same Reason as in preceeding Examples.

Ver. 72. — *prudencia fasces Et solii candor cinxit utrumque latus.*] This *fasces* is borrowed from that Symbol of Dignity and Power carried before the Roman Magistrates.

xc. 16. *Aurea — stamina vita.*] Golden Threads of Life. This seems an Allusion to the Fable of the Paræ or fatal Sisters, who are feign'd to spin the Thread of Man's Life\*.

xcvi. 8. — *figite dona tholis.*] } This seems an Al-

cxviii. 20. — *figere dona tholis.*] } lusion to the Heathenish Custom of hanging up the Gifts that were offered to their Gods upon the Walls of their Temples. The Israelites, I believe, had no such Custom.

cix. 7. — *calculus exeat ater.*] This an affected way of speaking for *Let him be condemned.* I doubt if the Israelites had such a Custom.

CX. I.

\* Buchan, Psal. lxxxix. 45. has --- *brevis immatura juvena Stamina præcidit.*



cx. 1. — *Dominus decemplicis aula.*] An affected way of speaking, borrowed from the *Ptolemaick* System of the World, which makes no fewer than *ten Heavens*. I suppose that in King *David's* Time such a System was not known, or thought of.

cxxxvii. 6. — *lingua Faucibus arescat fidere tacta meis*]

cxliii. 4. *Obstupuit mens — ceu fidere laevo Tacta*] This seems to be borrowed from a like ancient Notion, which supposed that those that had their *Tongue*, or any other Part of their Body disabled, imputed it to the *malign Influence* of the *Planets*. But whether they could say that of the *Mind*, as in this last Example, I shall not determine. Only I cannot omit observing, that in your Note on *Pf. xvi. 4.* (to which you here remit us) you tell us, that *laevus* sometimes signifies *prosper, secundus*, and bring for an Example that of *Virg. Geo. iv. 7.* — *si quem Numina laeva sinunt* — I know that *Servius*, and your *Erythræus*, take it there in that Sense; but *Turnebus, de la Cerda, Rueus*, and the whole Bulk of Commentators, take it in a contrary Sense, especially *A. Gellius*, who lived before them all, and has this Remark on the Words, *Virgilius singulari doctrinâ innuit Deos illos, quibus potestas est in laedendo, non in juvando.* I have taken Notice of the Impropriety of the *nomina laeva* in that *Psal. xvi.* above.

## II. Of Improprieties of Words or Phrases that seem to have a Levity in them, and to fall short of that Regard that ought to be paid to the Majesty of GOD.

v. 7. — *illustres sternar & ante pedes.*] *Illustres* I think too low to be said of God.

x. 12. *Elnat hos animo nulla senectâ tuo.*] This *nulla senectâ* seems to be borrowed from that of *Propertius, ii. 19. 45.* *At me ab amore tuo deducet nulla senectus*; but cannot (I think) be properly applied here to the *eternal God*, with respect to whom it is hardly fit to speak of *senectâ*.

*Et*. And though it should be said, that by *nulla senectus* is meant no more than *no Length of Time*; yet I am not fond of that Expression, when said of him whose Existence was before and beyond all Time.

xviii. 4. *Et facili planctum supplicis aure bibit.*

cxvi. 1. 2. *Et facili gemitus non semel aure bibit.*

— *Aure bibit facili gemitus.*] I think *aure bibere* too low a Phrase to be applied to Almighty God.

xxii. 3. — *pelagi tu surdior undâ es.*] Too low a Comparison to be said of God.

19. — *nectere parce moras.*] When said of God, *nectere moras* seems too low.

xxv. 8. *Est justus comisque Deus.*] I do not like *comis*; *lenis* or *mitis*, I think, would have done better.

xxxiii. 3. *Verbaque sunt ipsa candidiora nive.*] A flaunting Way of speaking, for, *The Word of the Lord is right.*

xxxiv. 8. *Percipe quàm vestri flagret amore Deus.*] Too loose and affected, for, *Taste and see that the Lord is good.*

xxxv. 23. *Eripe te stratis.*] Too light a Phrase to be used to God, [*Get thee out of thy Bed, or, Throw off thy Coverlets*] especially as it is but little countenanced by the *Orig.* *Stir up thyself.*

xli. ult. *Sitque dies titulis nulla suprema tuis.*] This seems to be a flaunting way of expressing, *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting and to everlasting.*

l. 16. *Quid tibi nobiscum est?*] A Phrase borrowed from *Martial*, *Epig.* ii. 22. 1. *Quid mihi vobiscum est, O Phœbe novemque sorores?* and *Epig.* ix. 69. 1. *Quid tibi nobiscum est, ludi scelerate magister?* but noways proper here, where it is spoken by God himself. It had been some better had it been, *Quid mihi vobiscum est?* but that which follows will not allow it. As it is, it gives us an Idea of God as of many. 'Tis true, that the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity are brought in as having a Consultation together, as in *Gen.* i. 26. and xi. 7. but that does not take place here.

17. — *littora bubus aro.*] *I till the Shore with Oxen*, i. e. *I lose my Labour.* A silly Expression in the Mouth of the great God! You it seems have thought it amiss, and have therefore changed it into *Das mea verba*

*Notis,*

*Notis*, by what Authority I know not; you certainly ought to have told us. However, I do not think even that grave enough, especially as it is a *Simile* he too much harps upon.

21. *Nam tua sunt digitis facta notata meis.*] A loose and low Way of expressing, *I will set them, (i.e. thy Sins) in Order before thee.* Buchanan grave and close, *Ante oculos tua facta ponam.* Johnston has imitated too much that of Ovid, *Traditur huic digitis charta notata meis.*

li. 14. — *ne cæde madentem Lethifer in poenas posce.*] I do not love the Epithet *Lethifer* applied, as here, to Almighty God.

lvii. 2. *Cujus & inceptum dextra coronat opus.*] Orig. *God that performeth all things for me.* This is not only a loose and low Way of speaking, but hath too great an Affinity to that cant Phrase, *Finis coronat opus.*

lx. 6. — *quo vate.*] I doubt if this is proper to be applied to God himself: For God is never called a *Prophet*, that Name being only proper to such as are inspired by him.

lxviii. 28. — *forti Maeste animo.*] An odd Phrase to be applied to Almighty God, and especially as it is little favoured by the Orig.

lxix. 27. *Crimina criminibus cumula.*] This, I confess, agrees pretty much with Orig. *Add Iniquity to their Iniquity*, but literally taken is harsh. Buchanan much better, *Tu sine peccatis cumulent peccata.*

lxx. 5. — *invisas moras.*] *Hated Delays.* Not proper, I think, to be used to Almighty God.

lxxviii. 60. *Nec mora, Silonis fugiens sacraria, dixit, Carra prius tellus, nunc odiosa, vale,*] This I think an Expression not grave enough in the Mouth of the great God.

lxxxix. 34. *Et rapiant voces ventus & unda meas.*] A Phrase too much dwelt upon, and the less proper here, as spoke by Almighty God: For it must sound thus: *Far be it from me, that the Wind and Water should carry away my Words.* Orig. *I will not alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips.* Buchanan close and grave, *Nec quod semel ore profudi Ulla immutabit venturi temporis atas.*

39. *Fœdera tu violans.*] This a little harsh to be said of  
C Almighty-



Almighty God. *Orig.* indeed is strong, *Thou hast made void the Covenant of thy Servant*, which therefore the Paraphrase ought rather to have softened than heightened, as all Interpreters do in this Place. *Buchanan*, tho' strong, is not so harsh: *Rata fœdera pacti Negligis.*

ciii. 8. ——— *non patienter amat.*] This Phrase, borrowed from *Ovid* and *Martial*, does not seem gravely enough applied to Almighty God.

9. *Nec litem de lite ferit*] An odd Phrase for, *He will not alway chide*, i. e. *doth not always chastise us for our Faults*, or so often or so severely as we deserve.

cvii. 1. ——— *bonitas cui passibus æquis It comes.*] i. e. *Whose Goodness keeps pace with himself*; so the Annotator seems to take it: Or, if you will join this with what follows, ——— *Et nullo limite clausus amor*, i. e. *whose Goodness and Love keep pace with one another*. Either Way it seems but an affected Imitation of *Virgil*, who uses the Phrase literally, and not metaphorically, as here.

cxxxii. 14. *Deliciumque animæ dimidiumque meæ.*] This too light and flaunting to be said by Almighty God. *Orig.* *I have desired it*, i. e. *Sion*, for the Place of my Abode; or even as in the old Translation, *I delight therein*. *Buchanan* shorter, but vastly better, *Hæc mihi grata domus.*

cxxxix. 6. ——— *Lyncea lumina.*] This Phrase, whether taken from one *Lynceus*, that had a very penetrating Eye, or from the Beast called *Lynx*, which is thought to be very sharp-sighted, is not grave enough, and consequently not proper to be said of the omniscient God.

cxliii. 1. *Auribus arrectis famuli, Deus, accipe questus.*] *Auribus arrectis* not grave enough.

cxlv. 8. *O tibi quam comis mens!*] Too low to be applied to the Mercy of God.

### III. Particular Improperities, which cannot be reduced to the two former Heads.

ii. 10. ——— *quæ regna tenes, quæ jura ministras Natio.*] *Natio* here seems too general a Word.

ix. 3. *Gelidam cæsa momordit humum.*] This Phrase of *Virgil* seems not very proper here. So also xxvii. 2.

ix. 9.

ix. 9. — *arcus* — *instar erit.*] This is very improper, but I believe it is a typographical Error (for *arcis*, Orig. a *Refuge*) which has spread through all the Copies, and has imposed upon the Annotator himself, who retains it not only in the *Text*, but also in the *Interpretation*.

ii. — *fama* l. *quatur anus.*] This, though used by *Catullus* and *Martial*, seems not here grave enough.

13. *Mors prius est, memini, te duce, victa mihi.*] This is a loose and affected Way of expressing, *Thou that liftest me up from the Gates of Death*. Besides, the *memini* seems idly brought in to make up the Verse.

xii. 3. — *Et ampullis ambitiosa tumet.*] Orig. *that speaketh proud things*. I doubt if *ampullis* be a proper Word here; for by that is meant a swelling or bombast kind of *Stile*. Hor. *Projicit ampullas Et sesquipedia verba*. And *ampullatur in arte*.

xvii. 9. *Hic gazas, jugulum per scelus ille petit.*] I know not what to make of *gazar* here. You interpret it *divitias meas*. But *gaze* commonly signifies great *Treasures*, such as those of Kings and Princes: Whereas *David* was at this Time in a very poor and low Condition.

14. *Arvaque discinctus sulcat avita nepos.*] This a loose and, I think, not a very proper Way of expressing, *They leave the rest of their Substance to their Babels*. There is nothing spoken of *Grand-children*, and far less that they should prodigally waste the Estates they succeeded to; for that is the Notion of the Phrase *discinctus nepos* in *Horace*, from whom it is taken.

xix. 1. *Numinis inscripti titulis sunt aetheris axes, Et rerum dominâ regia picta manu.*] This but a loose and affected Way of expressing, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, &c.* Besides, it is not easy to construe these Lines, especially the last. Your Interpretation is, *Arces aethereae sunt signatae Dei titulis, Et regia coeli est picta manu rerum dominante*. Whereas I would rather explain it, *Coeli machina, ejusque regia, quae picta est manu rerum omnium dominante, inscriptos habent summi numinis titulos*. But how much is this below the Gravity and Dignity of the Orig.? *Buchanan* incomparably better.

2. *Lux lucem noctemque premens nox altera.*] This, strictly

strictly speaking, is not true: For one Day or Night does not closely or immediately follow another, which is the proper Meaning of the Word *premo*. Buchanan uses it right, *Dies tenebras & tenebrae diem Semper prementes*; and he himself, xxxii. 4. *Seu premeret roscum nox revoluta diem*.

xx. 4. *Mollibus adspiret Zephyris*.] This a low Metaphor taken from Sailing, especially as applied to a King, who, for ought appears, never set his Foot in a Ship. But, whatever is in that, we are assured by the best Commentators, that this Psalm was composed as a Prayer, to be said or sung by the People for good Success to their King in some great Expedition, probably that against the *Ammonites* and *Syrians*, who came with great Numbers of Horsemen and Chariots to fight with him. See ver. 7.

xxi. 8. *Induet & manicas gens scelerata tuas*.] Shall put on thy Fetters. This low and remote from the Text, which has only, *Thy* (i. e. God's) *Right Hand shall find them out*. Buchanan has properly expressed it, *Tu perduelles comprehendes, tu manu Poenas reposces vindices*.

xxiv. 1. — *terramque sinu qui suscipit orbis*.] If *orbis* here is to be taken for the *Universe*, the Phrase seems not to be very proper; for that would import as if the Earth were not a Part of it. Besides, it appears that *Earth* and *World*, *terra* and *orbis terrarum*, are here the same thing; for immediately it follows, *He hath founded it upon the Seas, and established it upon the Floods*; which is noways true of the Heavens or celestial Orbs. Buchanan right.

2. — *flumineas fixit & inter aquas*.] Rivers are not, nor can be meant here.

5. *Et dabit electo cum grege recta sequi*.] I do not understand this, *And he will grant him to follow right things with his chosen Flock*. Orig. *He shall receive*——*Righteousness from the God of his Salvation*; where by *Righteousness* is plainly meant the *Reward of Righteousness*: But *recta sequi*, or (as it is interpreted) *sequi justitiam*, is a quite different thing; for that can signify nothing else, but to do *Acts of Righteousness*, which is said he had done in ver. *præced.*

xxix. 1. — *heroes*.] Not a proper Word, I think, for,  
Te



*Te mighty*, i. e. *Princes and Rulers of the World*. So *Psal.* cv. 28. *Illius heroes*, for *Moses and Aaron*; and cvi. 23. *legifer heros* for *Moses*; and *Psal.* xlv. 10. *Heroïna* for the *Queen or Bride* \*.

2. —*pandite laudes*.] Not proper, but I believe it is an Error of the Press in all the Copies, for *pangite*.

4. *Fulminis in morem*.] Not like *Thunder*; for here *Thunder* itself is meant, which is called the *Voice of the Lord*, as appears by what follows. See *Patrick and Wells* on this Psalm.

xxx. 6. *Cum freta sulcarem ventis felicibus*.] Here the Comparison is changed from a *Mountain* or strong *Castle* upon it, (see *ver.* 7.) to a *Ship* at Sea. But of this Comparison, which he dwells too much upon, see afterwards.

xxxii. 1. —*cui scelerum nævos Deus eluit*.] *Nævos* seems too low a Word, and ill coupled with *scelerum*. And *facta nefanda* in the next Verse seems too strong, unless to be applied to *David's* two great Sins of *Adultery* and *Murder*.

xxxiv. 4. *Cor ubi dirigit*.] This too strong, as being used only for a sudden Fright or Consternation. *Orig.* *He deliver'd me from all my Fears*.

5. —*obvius ulnis Excipiet*.] This, besides that the Sense is mistaken, is too flaunting an Expression. There is nothing of *Embraces* in *Orig.*

7. *Agminis aligeri cingit custodia justos*.] This *agminis aligeri* taken from *Virg. Æn.* xii. 249. and by him spoke of *Birds*: But I am not fond of our Author's applying it here and elsewhere to *Angels*.

9. *Flecte genu, gens sancta, Deo*.] Too low, and also too remote for, *Fear the Lord, ye his Saints*.

xxxv. 4. *Fabula fit*.] Too low for, *Let them be confounded*.

10. —*fortem Pusio prædonem, te duce, vincit inops*.] *Pusio inops* not a proper Phrase for the *poor and needy*; and the whole loose and affected.

13. *Et caput obstipum—fuit*.] *My Head stood awry*, or *hung to one Side*. An odd Phrase for *I humbled my Soul*.

---

\* *Vida* is yet worse, who calls our B. Saviour a *Hero*.

xxxvi. 1. *Auctibus immensis scelerum dum crescere fibras Conspicor, &c.*] This an affected Metaphor, and not agreeable enough to *Orig. The Transgression of the Wicked saith within my Heart.* This is spoke of one Person, probably King *Saul*, whose wicked Purposes, tho' cloak'd and disguised, *David* had discovered. Our Author applies this to many or all wicked Persons. *Buchanan* indeed is so far right, that he applies it to one Person, but then he describes that Person, as in Appearance *superstitiously religious*; which seems not to have been *Saul's* Character.

xxxvii. 3. *Ille larem—conferet.*] *He will bestow on thee an House.* Not expressive enough for, *Thou shalt dwell in the Land.* *Buchanan* much better: *Diuque terram ut incolae Donabit.* And, in the following Verse, *In hoc voluptas unica*, is much better than,

4. *Arbiter aethereus tibi sit mellita voluptas.*] Which is too flaunting for, *Delight thyself in the Lord.*

5. — *mediis in fluctibus unum Hunc specta; portum quem petis ille dabit.* This is his too much frequented Comparison, but far removed from the *Orig. Trust in him, and he will bring it to pass.* *Buchanan* incomparably better: *Committe vitam, rem, decus Illius uni arbitrio, Is te forebit jugiter, Votique reddet compotem.*

21. — *est iusto semper aperta manus.*] Besides that this seems not grave enough, I suspect it to be an Anglicism OPEN-HANDED, the contrary to which is CLOSE-FISTED.

23. *Sternit iter iusto.*] That is literally to *pave the Way*, or to *make it easy and passable*: But that is a different thing from *directing one in the right Way*, or *ordering his Steps*, as in *Orig.* *Buchanan* — *dirigit Ejus Deus vestigia.*

xxxviii. 16. *Et proclinatus prociadusque premar.*] This displeases me, because *proclinatus* and *prociadus* signify the same thing, and the last hath too near an Affinity with *succiduo* in the very next Verse.

xxxix. 1. — *ne forte—Audeat effari lingua proterva nefas.*] This *lingua proterva*, and this *effari nefas*, seem too strong, as if *David* was afraid lest his *unruly Tongue* should utter very *sinful* or *wicked* Expressions: Whereas his Fear was only, lest, by the Calumnies and Abuses of his

his Enemies, he might be provoked to use *intemperate Language* against them, or to speak *irreverently* of God's Providence. *Buchanan* applies it to the first, which is certainly the principal Meaning: *Mecum ipse verbis abstinere ab asperis Et jurgiis decreveram.*

xl. 12. *Liquitur & nimis mens superata vadis.*] I like nothing of this. 1<sup>st</sup>, There is nothing of his being in Danger of being swallowed up by Water in *Orig.* 2<sup>dly</sup>, There is an Impropriety in *mens superata*; for the Mind or Soul cannot be overcome or destroyed by Waters. 3<sup>dly</sup>, It is not proper to say, *mens superata vadis liquitur*; for *melting* is not an Effect of Water. All that the *Orig.* has, is, *My Heart faileth me.* *Buchanan* right, — *animus stupet, Curarum innumeris obrutus aestibus.*

xl. 3. — *humeris apta stellantibus ensem.*] *Ovid* has *gemmis stellantibus*; but whether that will justify *humeris stellantibus*, for, *Having your Shoulders sparkling with Gems, or precious Stones resembling Stars*, I know not: But why *apta humeris*? The Sword, I am sure, is commonly girded upon the *Thigh* or *Side*. *Virg. Ocyus ensem Eripit à femore:* And *Laterique Argivum accommodat ensem:* And so *Orig.* here, *Gird thy Sword upon thy Thigh.* *Johnston* had *Buchanan*, it seems, in his View, who has, — *age fortibus apta Ensem humeris*; but both, I think, are wrong.

xlvii. 7. *Hunc celebret quicquid mentis & oris habes.*] So your Edition; but all the former Editions, as well as *Mr. Lauder's*, have *habet*: But in both, the Sense is very awkward. For, according to the former, we must construe it, *quicquid mentis & oris tu habes, id hunc celebret.* But it is very improper to call upon one Person, as it were, to praise God, after he had in the preceding Verse invited all the World to do so, *Illius occasus solium veneretur & ortus*; for so I think it should be read, not *veneratur*, as in all the Copies. It seems no less an odd Way of speaking to construe the *habet*, in the latter Reading, (as we necessarily must, to make it Sense) with *occasus* and *ortus*, thus, *Quicquid occasus & ortus habet mentis & oris, id celebret hunc.* To avoid both these Inconveniences, I believe the true Reading is, or ought to be, *Hunc celebret qui quid mentis & oris habet.* But it is here fur-



ther worth observing, that *mentis* is all that we have to express *singing Praises* (as it is in *Orig.*) *with Understanding*: Which Interpreters do not directly apply to the *Devotion* of the *Heart*, but to the *Skill* in *Voice* or *Hand* of those so employ'd. *Buchanan* has justly taken it in this Sense, *Docti modorum dulcibus Hunc ferte in astra laudibus.*

xlix. 4. *Seria res agitur.*] Not, in my Opinion, a proper Phrase here; For that seems to insinuate, as if he was afraid that what he was to speak, might be taken for Things of a light or inconsiderable Nature. But that he had sufficiently caution'd against in the Verse preceeding, *Quæ loquar arcanos referans sapientia fontes Sugeret*—

13. *Dicta probat soboles improba pejor avis.*] This *pejor avis* seems not very pertinently brought in here, there being nothing for it in *Orig.* He has probably been led into it by that celebrated Passage in *Horace*, *Ætas parentum pejor avis*, &c.

20. — *dum tangit vertice cælum.*] Seems too flaunting and vague for, *Man that is in Honour.* *Buchanan* clear and full, *Rectrix honoris ni sapientia Accesserit*, &c.

l. 9. — *spectante popello.*] *Popello* (or *plebeculâ*, as you interpret it) is a Word of Contempt for the *Mob*, *Rabble*, or the *low People*; and therefore not proper here, since the highest, as well as the lowest of the *People*, were bound to offer and to partake of these Sacrifices. Accordingly the Address is to the whole *People* of *Israel*, *Isacidae advertite mentes.*

li. 18. — *Solymæ memori mœnia conde manu.*] This *memori manu* I know not what good for, unless to fill up the Verse,

lv. 13. — *vita delictumque meæ.*] This too much for *mine Acquaintance*, or *intimate Friend*.

lviii. 1. *Purpurei procures.*] I do not like the Phrase for, *O ye Congregation*, tho' taken for, *O ye Princes and Rulers met together in Council.* *Buchanan* much better, *Qui jura celsò de solio datis.*

lix. 1. — *populum rebellem Protere.*] Every Word here improper. 1. *Populum*: For by comparing the Title of this

this Psalm with 1 Sam. xix. 11. it appears that it refers not to a great *Multitude*, but to a few *Officers* that were sent by *Saul* to watch the House where *David* was, and to kill him. 2. *Rebellem*: These *Officers* were in no sense *Rebels*, (unless, as every Sinner is, against God;) for what they did, tho' wicked, was in Obedience to their lawful Sovereign. 3. *Protere*; For *David* is praying, not that they might be destroy'd; but that he might be deliver'd from them. *Buchanan* here perfectly right.

lx. 2. — *stringe quod intus hiat.*] Looe, I think, and improper for; *Heal the Breaches thereof.*

lxiii. 9. *Hostica gens imâ sorpta dehiscet humo.*] I do not understand what is meant by *gens dehiscet*, or (which is the same) *homines dehiscunt*. The Interpreter renders it *interibit*, which is far from the Signification of that Word. *Humus dehiscit, terra dehiscit, unda dehiscit, navigium dehiscit*, and the like, I have read, but *homines dehiscunt*, I never read: And if I did, the Meaning can hardly be other, but that the Parts of them, or their Members did *cleave asunder*, or were *separated* from one another; which there is no Occasion here to suppose. What hindred our Author to have said, — *sorpta peribit humo*, unless a very odd Affectation? To say that *gens dehiscet sorpta humo*, is put for *humus dehiscens sorbebit gentem*, &c. is such an *Hypallage*, as I know no Example of.

lxv. 5. *Quisquis & extremum trans mare tecta colit.*] Who are they that have their Habitations beyond the uttermost Sea or Ocean? It is generally supposed that the Sea or Ocean surrounds the Earth. *Circumfluit humor ultima possedit*, says *Ovid*. If so, there can be no Earth beyond it, and consequently no dwelling Place. *Orig.* has only, *them that are afar off upon the Sea*, i. e. *them that live in the Islands of the Sea*, as *Drs. Hammond* and *Patrick* interpret it, or (which I think as proper) *them that traffick or sail upon it*. *Buchanan* here is incomparably elegant, as well as just; *Finium terræ Deus ultimorum Spes, & extremas maris ambientis Gurgite terras*, i. e. *Who art the Hope* (*Orig. Confidence*) *of Land and Sea*, metonymically, for the *Inhabitants* of the one, and *Voyagers*

gers on the other ; where, by the by, he makes the Sea to encompass the Land.

lxix. 20. — *sexcentis lacerarunt pectora curis.*] *Sexcentis* seems not grave enough for *innumeris*.

31. — *vitulus quam corniger aras Ante cadens bifido dum pede pulsat humum.*] I do not think *pulsat humum*, proper ; for that generally signifies to dance: Which cannot well be applied to a Calf, which when sacrificed is struck down at once, or bound before he is killed.

36. — *serique nepotes Qui — pone sequuntur avos.*] The *seri* and the *pone* seem here ill coupled together; the one signifying at a great, and the other at a small Distance of Time. *Buchanan* clear, *Quæ placida teneat series in pace nepotum.*

lxx. 3. — *me qui petulante cachinno Excipit.*] This is an affected way of speaking, taken from that of *Persius*, *Quid faciam? sed sum petulanti splene cachinno*: Tho' *cachinno* in this last is a *Nominative*; in the other an *Ablative*.

lxxiii. 1. *Quam favet Isacidis, &c.*] I do by no means think it proper to begin this Psalm with an Exclamation or Admiration of the Divine Goodness: The Design of it being to shew, that notwithstanding that bad Men frequently enjoy more Prosperity in this World than the good and pious; yet these, in the End, shall be rendred more happy than they, and shall have no Reason to complain of the seemingly unequal Distributions of Providence. I own likewise that *Buchanan's* long Introduction to this Psalm does not altogether please me, as having too great an Affinity to *Horace's Si fractus illabatur orbis, &c.*

lxxiv. 8. — *dicebant, perditæ, flammæ.*] An odd Apostrophe, *O vos flammæ perditæ*: Much like the *postica sanna*, Ps. i.

lxxviii. 36. — *verba byssina.*] Fine *flaxen Words*, for *flattering Words*. I do not like the Phrase, nor know I any that use it.

54. *Et juga cœlesti sub juga missa manu.*] *Juga missa sub juga*, where the Words are taken in a different Sense, is to me a very improper way of speaking. You was sensible



sensible of this, and therefore, by what Authority I know not, have changed it into *Culinaque aetheria* s. j. m. m. But even that is what I am hardly pleas'd with: For I do not remember where *culmina* is used for the *Tops* of *Hills*, unless *montium* be added.

lxxviii. 68. — *divini captus amore loci.*] What means *divini* here? Was the Place *divine*, till God, by his special Residence in it, made it so.

70. — *hirsutos lanigerosque greges.*] *Hirsutos*, says the Annotator, is meant of the *Goats*, and *lanigeros* of the *Sheep*. There is nothing of *Goats* in *Orig.* nor do I think they should be mentioned here.

72. — *prudencia fasces Et solii candor cinxit utrumque latus.*] An affected way of speaking for, *He fed them according to the Integrity of his Heart, and guided them by the Skillfulness of his Hands*, i. e. *He ruled them with Justice and Prudence*, or, as *Buchanan* has it, *Studio curaque fidei*. I have taken Notice of *fasces* under another Head.

lxxix. 7. *Segregis populi.*] And Pl. lxxxix. 19. *Segrego populo.*] And cxi. 4. *Sequestrati chori.*] And lxv. 4. *Sequestratos.*] I think none of these proper Phrases for God's select or peculiar People. *Buchanan*, in the first of these, has *Semen piorum*. In the second, *Media de plebe*, [*Orig. out of the People*,] In the third, there is nothing in *Orig.* of peculiar People; but only that *He hath made his wonderful Works to be remembred*, viz. by our Forefathers; and so *Buchanan*, *stupuere parentes*, and *miranda natis*. And in the fourth, *Quos legis, lectos facies amicos*.

lxxx. 7. — *ingenium populi moresque probavi.*] *Probo*, for ought I know, signifies always, either to prove a thing to be true; or to approve a thing upon Tryal or Experiment. But here it is otherwise: For God indeed did try their Manners at *Meribah*; but, by what follows, it appears that they were far from being such as he could approve of \*.

*Ibid.* *Cum Meribæ querulis ora rigavit aquis.*] I know not what this means. You interpret it: *Cum humectavit*

---

\* I know that in the *Vulgate*, and some other *Latin* Versions, it is rendred *probavi* &c. But I much doubt, if *probare ingenium*, or *mores alios*, simply, for to try them, is *Latin*,

pit [*populus* sc.] *ora sua querulis aquis Meribæ*. But what is that? They were not the Waters of *Meribah* or of *Strife*, that murmured; but the People, for want of Water. I wonder that the Annotator (who is at so much Pains to point out the figurative Words and Phrases of his Author) has not taken Notice of this, which is indeed what they call an *Hypallage*, but to me a very strange, and, for ought I know, an unprecedented one. *Scelerata hasta*, and *infesta arma*, and the like, are used by the Poets, for *hasta hominis scelesti*, and *arma infestorum hostium*: But *aquæ querulæ*, for *aquæ querulorum*, or *hominum de inopia aquæ conquerentium*, is to me without Example.

8. — *jurato nec mihi deme fidem*.] Why *jurato*? There is nothing of an Oath in *Orig*.

lxxxii. 3. *Legibus armentur tennes*.] This seems a little affected, for *legibus defendantur*; and seems to be borrowed from that affected *Chiasmus* (as they call it) of the Emperor *Justinian*, in the *Proem*. of his *Institutions*, *Imperatoriam majestatem non solum armis decoratam, sed etiam legibus oportet esse armatam*.

5. — *in priscum spontere lapsa chaos*.] This *spontere* improper, and the whole exaggerated.

lxxxiii. 2. — *cristis cominus astra ferit*.] *Orig*. They lift up the Head, *Buchanan*, *cristas erigunt*; which *Johnston* has too much exaggerated. Besides, the *cominus* is quite superfluous.

3. — *utque pios solâ caligine tutos Opprimat*.] *Orig*. against thy bidden ones. It seems loose and not proper to call them *solâ caligine tuti*.

9. — *subito transfixus Sisera ferro*.] Who reads this, without consulting the History, would imagine that *Sisera* was suddenly thrust through with a Sword; whereas he was kill'd, by having his Temples transfix'd with a Nail. The Interpreter has not adverted to this, who expounds it, *confossus improviseo gladio*.

lxxxiv. 1. *O quibus imperiis me tua templa trahunt*.] An odd Expression, *trahunt imperiis*; and it is a little forced in the Interpretation, to render *imperiis* by *viribus*. There seems likewise to be two Improperities in the Word *templa*. 1<sup>st</sup>, That it is in the Plural; whereas God's

God's Temple at *Jerusalem* (which must here be meant) was but one. 2dly, If this Psalm was composed in King *David's* Time, as is thought by some, the Temple was not then built. In *Orig.* it is called *Tabernacles*, because the *Israelitish* Tabernacle consisted of several Parts, which, in a certain Sense, were so many different *Tents* or smaller *Tabernacles*. Dr. *Patrick* supposes the Psalm to be written in the Time of *Hezekiah*, when *Sennacherib's* Army had block'd up the Way to *Jerusalem*, and to the Service of the Temple. According to which, *Buchanan* is right, who has only *limina templi*.

10. *Aurea purpurei sibi servant atria Reges.*] This seems too high a Flight, for *The Tents of Wickedness*.

lxxxv. 2. *Agminis electi tua quondam gratia navos Texit.*] I like neither *agminis*, nor *quondam*, nor *navos*, *Orig.* *Thou hast forgiven the Iniquity of thy People.* 1. *Agmen* is not a proper Word, when a whole Nation, Men, Women and Children, are understood. 2. *Quondam*, not fit; for that properly signifies some indefinite Time past: Whereas here is to be understood a Thing just now done. And 3. *Navos* is too soft a Word, for gross *Iniquities*, especially *Idolatry*: Which some think is principally meant here. [See above, *Pf.* xxxii. 1. xxxix. 8. lxxix. 9. and after, *Pf.* ciii. 3.] *Buchanan* has one of these Faults, viz. the *quondam*; which, for the Reason mentioned, I cannot approve.

lxxxvi. 7. *Aure Deus facili tu mea verba leges.*] I do not think *leges aure* proper, especially as he seems to have borrowed the last Part of the Verse from *Ovid. Her. xviii.* 4. *Invitis oculis hæc mea verba leges*, where the Phrase is used in the common Acceptation of the Words. The Interpreter was aware of this, and therefore takes the Verb *leges* in another Sense, rendring it, by *excipies*, *Thou shalt gather or pick up.* But tho' *lego* primarily signifies *to gather*; yet, as it is here coupled with *aure*, I am not fond of the Phrase.

lxxxviii. 14. — *animam mediis cur linqvis in undis?* Not very proper; for the Soul cannot be affected with Water. *Orig.* *Why castest thou off my Soul?* *Buchanan* right. — *animæ auxilium cur subtrahis ægræ.*

Ibid.



Ibid. *Cur tua jactatae subtrahis ora rati?*] This the Comparison too much harped upon; but the more improper here, that this Psalm was composed by *Heman the Ezrabite*, upon the Occasion (as is thought) of his being thrown into a Dungeon in the Time of the *Babylonish* Captivity. *Buchanan* uses this Comparison, *Ver. 8. Quos portum afflicta spes erat esse rati*, but I'm not fond of it.

lxxxix. 5. *populi quos tuus urit amor.*] I shall not mention that the best Interpreters apply all this to the *Angels* or *Heavenly Inhabitants*. But what signifies *tuus amor urit*, or, as it is explain'd by the Annotator, *tuus amor accendit*? That properly signifies *the Love that God bears to his People*; whereas here is meant, *the Love that his Saints had to him*. He should therefore have said, *amor tui*; *amor tuus*, in that Sense, being very unusual.

6. — *purpureo grege.*] For *Kings* and *Princes*. I do not love *grege*; for it would sound harshly in *English*, *The Flock* or *Herd* (or even *Company* or *Band*) of *Kings* or *Princes*. They are not mentioned here with Contempt, (as that Word seems to import) but only it is said, that *they are not to be compared to the Lord*. Besides, it is thought that by *the Sons of the Mighty*, (as our Translation has it) are to be understood the *Angels*, and not *Kings*. *Orig.* is literally, *in filiis Deorum*. So *Vatablus*, *Hammond*, *Patrick* and *Wells* expound the Place.

16. — *surget humo.*] Somewhat too low, for *shall be exalted*. *Virgil's tollere humo*, and *Horace's spernit humum*, will hardly justify it; for the Words following in these Authors raise the Idea higher.

19. *Donavi Solymis praestanti corpore regem.*] *Praestanti corpore*, a low Commendation for a King. *Orig.* one that is *mighty*. The Expression would have much better agreed to King *Saul* than to King *David*.

27. *Sceptrigerique ducem praesidiumque chori.*] *Orig.* Higher than the *Kings of the Earth*. Not that he was to be Captain and Protector of all Kings. *Buchanan* clear.

50. — *procerum ludibria.*] *Procerum* not a right Word for the *mighty People*; or, as Dr. *Patrick* explains it, *The Reproaches of many and mighty Nations*: Which takes in many more than the *Proceres*, or great Men.

Bu-

Buchanan more judicious, who calls them, *impia turba*; *turba profana*; and Verse following, *innumerae gentes*.

xc. 10. — *ferimur rapidis æmula turba Notis*.] This the too much affected Allusion to the Winds, and too loose (it would seem) here, *We are carried away as a Company resembling the rapid South Winds*.

xcii. 10. *Vinciet & serto multicolore comas*.] How remote is this from, *My Horn shalt thou exalt like the Horn of an Unicorn*. By which is chiefly meant, that he should be formidable to his Enemies. Buchanan comes pretty near it, *crudo vigentem robore*: It arising from one's Strength that his Enemies are afraid of him.

xciv. 15. — *armatus legibus æquis*.] See above lxxxii. 3.

xcix. 6. — *blesus Moses*.] I do not think *blesus* a proper Epithet here to *Moses*. It seems disparaging to that great Prophet, to say, *Stammering Moses pray'd to God*.

ci. 2. — *posthac tua iussa faceßam*.] *Posthac* seems improper here: For that implies that formerly he had done otherwise; for which there is no Ground.

4. *Meque sinistrorum nulla libido trahet*.] *Sinistrorum*, without a Substantive, is not, in my Opinion, a just Word for froward Persons.

ciii. 4. *Ille tuas animat cineres*.] This stretched beyond Bounds. *Orig. Redeemeth thy Life from Destruction*, i. e. *bath saved thee from Death*. So *rediviva perpete lauru tempora cingit*. And Ver. 5. *mille deliciis*, all overstrain'd.

cv. 12. — *memini*.] This *memini* is not only superfluous, but very improper: For how could *David*, (who was certainly the Author of the first 15 Verses, if not of the whole of this Psalm: See 1 *Chron.* xvi. 8, &c.) I say, how could *David* remember what happened many hundreds of Years before he was born?

13. *Nec mora, nec requies; populis heu præda profanis Cessit; in exilium nec semel acta fuit*.] I am pleas'd with none of this. 1. *Nec mora, nec requies*, seems a puerile Imitation (and improperly applied) of those Words of *Virg. Geo.* iii. 110. and *Æn.* v. 458. speaking of the Keen-

Keeness of the Contenders for Victory: To which this bears no Resemblance. 2. It is not true, that they, *i. e.* Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, (for of them he is speaking) did ever become a Prey to any King or People. *Orig.* has only, *They went from one Nation to another.* 3. The *acta in exilium* seems too strong, tho' it may in some measure be allowed, if taken in the Sense of that of *Virg. Æn.* iii. 4. *Diversa exilia, & diversas querere terras Auguriis agimur Divum;* in which Sense Buchanan uses the Word *exul* here: *Regna quanquam & nationes exul errans verteret.*

cvi. 7. *Hos latuit, &c.*] Too much; for they could not well be ignorant of what is so often inculcated in the Books of *Moses*, and the Passover was design'd a constant Memorial of. *Orig.* has indeed, *understood not*; but that means no more, but that they did not duly consider it, or, as Buchanan words it, *Nec—tua Ostenta graviter ponderarunt.* \*

cvi. 8. *O precor, &c.*] This, which is repeated, *ver.* 15; 21, and 31. seems not very proper; for tho' the *Engl.* Translation begins with *Oh!* (for which there is nothing in *Orig.*) yet it seems rather an Exhortation than a Prayer. I therefore prefer *Buchanan*, who has, *Ergo canant, &c.* in which he has imitated the *Vulgate* and *Pagninus's* Version, *Celebrent ergo, &c.*

10. —*lethi caligine mersos.* } This seems too much for  
14. —*lethi tenebris.* } the Shadow of Death; for that

---

\* In Mr. *Benson's* Edition it is *hoc latuit*, on which the Annotator has this odd Remark, *LATET est inter verba quæ vocant impersonalia, quomodo etiam apud Virgilium, Nec latuere doli fratrem Junonis & iræ. Refertur hoc ad totam sententiam; quasi dixerit, Hoc negotium, quæ scilicet Rector cæli, &c.* In which, by a strange Oscitancy, he applies to this Reading of his, what was only applicable to the true one, *hoc latuit*, where the Verb indeed seems to be taken impersonally; whereas if we read it *hoc latuit*, the Nominative *hoc* is plainly express'd, as are the *doli* and *iræ* before the *latuere* in *Virgil*. But, to pass this, and come to the Author himself, the Construction is very unusual, whether we read *hoc* or *hoc latuit*. In the former, *latuit*, is put for *latuere*, for, *quæ Rector cæli præstitit* follows, not *quod*. In the latter it is yet worse, *Hoc (negotium scilicet) quæ Rector cæli præstitit*. I know Grammarians account for such Ways of speaking, by supplying *negotium* or *negotia*, as they have Occasion.



that seems to imply *real Death*: But the other, in the Scripture Phrase, signifies only some great *Trouble, Distress, or Danger*, and here is taken for being confined to a *dark Prison*. Buchanan right: *Carceris in tenebris & cæca nocte jacebant*. And — *mortisque timorem Reppulit, & tetrici pavidos eduxit ab umbris*.

cvii. 22. *Quas decet, huic libet, curvato poplite grates.*] An odd Phrase, *libet grates*, and no less odd your Interpretation, *sacrificet gratias*, when you might have said *offerat*. We say by a Hebraism, *Let them sacrifice the Sacrifices of Thanksgiving*. Vulg. *Sacrificet sacrificium laudis*: But I am pretty positive that no good Author would say, *libet* or *sacrificet laudem* or *gratias*. Buchanan just and elegant, *Et meritis cumulent memores altaria donis, Et gratâ acceptam testentur voce salutem*. In Comparison of this last Line, how flaunting is that of *Johnston*, *Et canat ætherei clara tropæa patris*.

38. — *gregibus petulcis.* } I think both these  
*Vixque suas numeret ---- oves.* } a little affected.  
 Buchanan grave and judicious, — *proventibus auget Assiduis pecorum fœtus*.

cix. 11. — *hostis Bellipotens.*] Orig. *The Stranger*, Pagninus and the *Vulgate*, *Alieni*. Whether by *Stranger* is meant the same Person with the *Extortioner* or *Fœnerator* in the former Part of the Verse (as Dr. *Patrick*) or another Person (as Dr. *Wells* supposes) it seems certain that nothing more is intended, but one (or more) that were no Relations, or Neighbours of his, though of the same Country; and not a *foreign Enemy*, in a *hostile* manner, as *bellipotens* at least implies. Buchanan much better, *Ignotus hæres*.

16. *Sit potior voti pars, precor, ipse sui.*] An odd and affected Phrase for, *So let it [curling] come unto him*. He seems to have borrowed it from that of *Ovid*, *Pont.* iii. 2. 25. *Pars estis pauci potior*, but has ill applied it here.

cxii. 2. *Pandet & in placido candida vela salo.*] This the too much frequented Comparison, and very loose and affected for, *The Generation of the upright shall be blessed*. Buchanan close and grave, *Prolem piorum numinis benignitas Largâ beabit dexterâ*. The preceeding Part of the

Verse, *Sceptra geret soboles*, &c. I have taken notice of as improper elsewhere, p. 18.

10. *Euris Sentiet iratis vota nefanda rapi.*] This much of a Piece with the former, and very loose, for, *The Desire of the Wicked shall perish*. Buchanan more close: *Dominus malorum vota ridet irrita.*

cxiv. 6. — *ut hirti Dux gregis, hirsutæ matris & agna comes.*] *Hirti gregis* and *hirsutæ matris*: This Epithet does not, I think, properly belong to *Sheep*, but to *Goats*, whose Hair is rough and shaggy. Buchanan right. See above *Psal.* lxxviii. 70.

cxv. 1. — *Ne nos titulis illustribus orna.*] Too flaunting for, *Not unto us give the Glory*. Buchanan here grave and copious.

cxvii. 2. — *geminus despicit orbis apex.*] Here I suppose are meant the two *Poles* of the World: But the Word *despicit* is improperly, in my Opinion, applied to one of them: For the Antients had no Notion of the *Antipodes*. This appears from that of *Virgil*, *Geo.* I. 242. *Hic vertex nobis semper sublimis, at illum Sub pedibus Styx atra videt, Manesque profundi.* So that if the South Pole was *sub pedibus* of the infernal Inhabitants, it could not *despicere* or look down upon them. Nay, for this Reason it is, that *Johnston* himself, *Psal.* lxxxix. 12. calls the North Pole *sublimis Arctos*, and the South Pole *humilis axis*.

cxviii. 3. *Dicat Aron vates & sacri sanguinis auctor.*] Orig. *Let the House of Aaron now say.* By which is to be understood the *Priests* descended of *Aaron*, and not *Aaron* himself, who was dead many hundreds of Years before. 'Tis true, that in *ver. preced.* it is said, *Let Israel now say*, for the Children or Posterity of *Israel*; but I doubt if that will justify this: For the Word *Israel* is very frequently in Scripture used for the whole People of God, descended of *Jacob* or *Israel*: But I no where find, that *Aaron* is used for the *House* or *Progeny* of *Aaron*. Buchanan is more exact, who uses for the one *Soboles Jacobi*, and for the other *Aronis numerosa propago*.

26. — *qui missus ab æthere summo Fert secum Domini jussa sacrata sui.*] All this, especially the last Part, very remote from, *Blessed be he that cometh in the Name*

of the Lord, i. e. *Blessed be the King, who is set over us by Divine Appointment.*

CXIX. 16. — *una Hæc meam fulcit Cynosura puppem.*] Not to mention the too frequent Use of this Metaphor, it seems a very loose and improper Paraphrase of, *I will have a Respect unto thy Ways.* Besides, the *Cynosura* sounds but oddly in the Mouth of an *Israelite*. *Buchanan* perfectly agreeable to the Text: *Illa cogitem, illa seſter, illa mirer unicè.*

30. *Per fluctus Helicen hanc ſequar unicam.*] This is of a piece with the former, and pretty remote from, *Thy Judgments have I laid before me.*

112. *Dum—offa velantur cute.*] A flaunting and affected Expreſſion for, *Even unto the End, i. e. of my Life.*

117. — *paſſibus æquis Te ſequar.*] This *paſſibus æquis*, borrowed from *Virgil*, ſeems ill applied here, as it may ſignify that the *Pſalmiſt* paid a moſt perfect Obedience to the Laws of God, or was as righteous as God himſelf; which is infinitely far from being true of any meer Man, *Job* having repreſented that the *Heavens are not pure* in the Sight of God, and that *he chargeth even the very Angels with Folly.*

136. — *lactymarum obruor oceano.*] The ſtrong Hyperbole in the *Orig. Rivers of Water run down mine Eyes*, is carried beyond all Bounds. *Buchanan* juſt, — *fluunt mihi more rivi lacrymæ.*

157. *Me licet cingant tumidæ procellæ.*] This the much frequented Metaphor, but not enough proper for, *Many are my Perſecutors.* *Buchanan* cloſe, *Me prementum multitudo, &c.*

CXX. 5. *Cur Nomadas inter deſerta mapalia ſector? Inter inhumanos cur ego vivo Getas.*] None of theſe People known to the *Israelites*, far leſs dwelt among by *K. David*, unleſs by the laſt is meant the *Gittites*, a People of *Gath*. But I am ſure that by *Getæ* in *Ovid*, from whom he has borrowed this Pentameter, [*Pont. l. 5. 66. Inter inhumanos eſſe Poeta Getas. And iii. 5. 28. Inter inhumanos maluit eſſe Getas. And iv. 13. 22. Inter inhumanos nomen habere Getas.*] is meant a fierce People in *Thrace*, and ſo the Annotator deſcribes them; who alſo makes the



*Nomades* a People of *Scythia Europæa*, (where by the by *K. David* never was) whereas *Virgil*, whom you boast of *Dr. Johnston's* having so much imitated, makes them a People of *Mauritania*, *Æn.* iv. 320. and 535. and describes their *mapalia* mentioned here, *Geo.* iii. 340. *Buchanan* 'tis true has *mapalia*, which is a general Word, and will likewise agree to the wild *Arabs*, which most Interpreters think is here signified by the Tents of *Kedar* in the Text: He has therefore rendred it, *Latrones inter atque inhospita Gentis fera mapalia*.

cxxii. 5. *Davidis*—*solum quod præsidet orbi*.] This not true, and therefore improper, unless applied to *Jesus Christ*, for which there was no Occasion here. *Buchanan* a little loose in this Place.

cxxiv. 6. —*corvos qui ludit hiantes*. } The first of  
ibid. —*prædam non finit esse lupis*. } these, taken  
from *Horace*, too light; and both the *corvi* and the *lupi*  
not very proper for cruel and rapacious Men. *Buchanan*  
right.

cxxviii. 5. *Dumque trabes lucis, Solymam florescere—*  
*cernes*.] If *trabere lucem* be taken in the same Sense with  
*trabere vitam* in *Virg. Æn.* ii. 96. it will not be proper  
here, where Joy and Satisfaction is intended; not, as there,  
*Misery* and *Anxiety*. I doubt much if it would be *Latin*  
to say, *trabere vitam*, or *lucis*, in *gaudio*, *voluptate*, or  
the like. *Buchanan* is clear and plain, *Donec vita manebit*.

ult. *Auctibus immodicis spectabis surgere prolem*.] This  
*immodicis* is beyond all Bounds. Besides, the Psalmist's  
Meaning is not directly, *Thou shalt have a numerous Off-*  
*spring*, (though *immodicis auctibus* is too much even for  
that) but, *Thou shalt enjoy a long and prosperous Life*, so  
as to see thy Children's Children. *Buchanan* right, *Prolis*  
*adspicies tuæ Longâ stirpe propaginem*.

cxxx. 1. —*cristas attollo comantes*.] Too flaunting  
and loose a Phrase for, *My Heart is not haughty*.

cxxxv. 5. *Non ignota loquor*.] i. e. I speak the things  
that are well known to others, as well as myself: Whereas  
the Orig. is only, I know, i. e. I have a due Sense upon my  
Mind, that the God, under whose Government we are, is

tran-

transcendently greater than all other Beings, though called by that Name. See Patrick.

7. —*evocat auras.*] It is so in Mr. Benson's, Lawder's, and (I believe) all the other Editions: But I think Johnston has writ it *Euros*, which in my Opinion is much better than *auras*, that appearing too low for strong and violent Winds, which the Commentators think are here signified. This seems to be confirmed by the *hiberni Noxi* in the following Line.

10. *Mille simul ferro domiti periere tyranni.*] I like neither the *mille*, nor the *simul*. The first is an exorbitant Number, though we should, as in next Verse, take in all the Kings of Canaan. The second is not true, for it took up a considerable Time to conquer these Kings. Buchanan just to Orig.

16. —*pelagi surdior auris aquâ.*] Too flaunting. Buchanan plain and grave, —*surdus sonus advolat aures.*

cxxxvii. 1. —*fusi Babylonis ad undas.*] I do not like *fusi*; for that signifies rather lying or lolling at Ease, than sitting, (which is the Word in the Text) in a mournful and down-cast Posture. And if the Word shall be taken as applied to a routed and flying Army, that will as little answer to Sitting or Rest.

cxxxix. 20. —*in te genuinum stringit.*] This, borrowed from Persius's *Genuinum fregit in illis*, seems loose and improper.

22. —*odi cane pejus & angue.*] This, taken from Horace, is too flaunting, and not grave enough.

cxl. 3. —*Libycis vipera tecta rubis.*] K. David was little, and probably not at all, acquainted with the Vipers of Libya. Buchanan right, by keeping in general.

cxli. 6. *Verba mihi discent plena fuisse favis.*] i. e. They shall learn that my Words were full of Honey Combs. This very affected for, They shall bear my Words, for they are sweet, i. e. mild and dutiful to K. Saul. So the best Interpreters expound the Place.

cxlii. 7. *Divitiisque tuis lautitiisque fruar.*] This a little affected for, Thou shalt deal bountifully with me.

cxliii. 4. —*nec in toto pectore pectus erat.*] So the former Copies; but in your Edition, I know not by what

Authority, it is changed into, — *pectore robur erat*; tho' in my Opinion it was fully as well before. Orig. *My Heart within me is desolate*, i. e. literally, *My Heart within me is no Heart*; or, as Dr. Patrick expresses it, *I am ready to swoon away in this great Perplexity*. Thus we say of one in great Trouble, that he is *heartless*, or *has lost his Heart*; and, in like manner, that one is *dispirited*, i. e. *mightily dejected*: Which I think, in a poetical Way, may be strongly and pathetically exprest, *Nec in toto pectore pectus erat*; the same Way as in that of Martial, *de Spect.* vii. 6. *Inque omni nusquam corpore corpus erat*; and *Epig.* vii. 61. 2. *Inque suo nullum limine limen erat*: Which probably have given a Hint to our Author for this witty Turn of Thought.

cxliv. 1. — *mea temperat arma.*] Interp. *Moderatur mea arma*. But neither of these, in my Opinion, come up to Orig. *Who teachest my Hands to War*, i. e. *Gives me Strength and Skill to handle Arms*. *Temperare orbem, ratem, equor, &c.* are used in a different Sense. Buchanan here perfectly right.

4. — *atas futilis umbra* *More vaga levibus transvolat acta rotis.*] I do not admire *futilis* here, and in several Places elsewhere; and far less *atas acta rotis*: And if that be *more vaga umbra*, then, to keep up the Similitude, *Shadows* must be driven with *Chariot-wheels* too. Neither of which do I think proper.

10. *Jure patrocinii tu regum sceptrum gubernas.*] Orig. *It is he that giveth Salvation to Kings*. I know not what *jure patrocinii* [by the Right of Patronship] here is good for, unless it be to signify, that God has a special Right to govern Kings, as if he had not the same Right to govern all his Creatures. I own that Almighty God is, as exprest in the Liturgy, *the only Ruler of Princes*; and that he does in a particular Manner take good Kings under his Care and Protection, though oftentimes (for wise Ends) he permits wicked Men to prevail against them: But that is not the Meaning of the Psalmist in this Place, but only, that *even the most powerful Kings owe their Safety and Victories to God, and not merely to their own Conduct, Valour and great Armies*. Buchanan right.



exlviii, 1. — *cœli qui juga summa tenes.*] *Juga cœli* for, in the Heights, i. e. *Te celestial Powers, that live in the Regions above.* But why in the sing. Number, when here all the holy *Angels* are meant? This, and what follows, seems a little affected. *Buchanan* much more grave and judicious.

2. — *rutilans sine corpore cœtus.*] Seems a little too far fetcht for *Angels*.

7. — *tellure sub ima Trux draco.*] This *tellure sub ima* is, first, an Addition to the Text; for all Deeps in it are express'd by the Words following, — *vasta maris quicquid & unda tegit.* Again, as the Words seem to be borrowed from that of *Virg. Æn. vi. 459. Si quæ fides tellure sub ima est,* and are used by him for *Hell*, or the *infernal Regions*; I do not think them properly applied. Not to mention, That what we translate *Dragons*, *Hammond*, *Patrick* and *Wells* interpret *Whales*, which cannot be said to be under the Earth.

9. — *tetricæ rupes.*] *Tetricæ* hardly a proper Epithet to *rupes*.

10. — *quæ secat æthera pennis Natio.*] I know not how far *natio*, for a Species of Animals, is allowable.

cl. 1. *Fer super astra Deum.*] Why is this (which is six times repeated by our Author, and in the *Orig.* thirteen times) put in the sing. Number? especially if this Psalm was to be sung by the *Levites*, as some think, or (as *Dr. Patrick* will have it) that the Psalmist here exhorts all Creatures in Heaven and Earth, from the highest to the lowest, to praise God.

To these Improproprieties, remarked as above, I have reserved to be added one of a more general Kind, viz. our Author's Metaphor or Allusion to *Sailing* or *Sea-faring*, for which I see no Foundation in the *Orig.* 'Tis true, the Psalmist sometimes speaks of his being in danger of perishing in *thick Mires*, or *deep Waters*; by which, I think, are to be understood the great Perils he underwent from the Persecutions of his Enemies, especially *Saul*. But then, as King *David*, for ought appears, had no Occasion of betaking himself to Sea; whereas *Mo-*

*rasses, deep Mires, and Rivers*, could not but frequently fall in his Way, when he was so often obliged to fly from one Place to another; I do not think it proper he should use that Metaphor. *Buchanan* indeed has it sometimes: But that being but twice or thrice, so far as I can remember, it may in some measure be excused. But the numerous Repetitions of it in our Author, some of which I have remarked as improper on other Accounts, is, I think, hardly justifiable. Take the Instances I have observed of that Kind, as follow;

- xx. 4. *Mollibus adspiret Zephyris.*  
 xxx. 6. *Cum freta fulcarem ventis felicibus.*  
 xxxvii. 5. — *mediis in fluctibus unum Hunc Specta,*  
*portum quem petis, ille dabit.*  
 xxxix. 7. *Ancora tu nostræ — rati es.*  
 xlii. 9. — *animæ portus & aura meæ.*  
 li. 1. *Adspiret famulo mollior aura tuo,*  
 liv. 7. — *venti securus & undæ.*  
 lv. 23. *Ancora tu vitæ.*  
 lxi. 3. — *fureret cum fluctibus æquor.*  
 lxii. 2. — *portusque salutis Unicus.*  
 lxix. 14. — *dum furit ira maris.*  
 15. *Et peream tumidas naufragus inter aquas.*  
 lxxi. 5. *Unus eras vitæ portus.*  
 lxxiii. 3. *Et dare propitiis impia vela Notis.*  
 10. — *irati quem rapit unda freti.*  
 lxxxvi. 6. *Ne pereat pelagi spes mea mersa vadis.*  
 lxxxviii. 14. *Cur tua jactatæ subtrahis ora rati.*  
 xciv. 22. — *portusque salutis, Quaque vehor fragilem*  
*sustinet ille ratem.*  
 cxii. 2. *Pandet & in placido candida vela salo.*  
 cxxviii. 2. *Lenibus & Zephyris vela secunda dabis,*  
 cxli. 8. *Ne — timidæ desere vela ratis.*

SOMEWHAT of the same Kind are his Metaphors or Allusions to the *Winds*; as,

- xviii. 22. — *nec in æquoris undas — tulere Noti.*  
 xxi. 2. *Vana nec alipedes verba tulere Noti.*  
 1. 17. — *das mea verba Noti.* As your Edition has it,

lxvi. 17.

- lxxvi. 17. — *vota ferenda Notis.*  
 lxxi. 2. — *vota ferenda Notis.*  
 lxxvi. 8. — *vota ferenda Noto.*  
 lxxx. 4. — *vota ferenda Notis.*  
 lxxxix. 34. *Et rapiant voces ventus & unda meas.*  
 xc. 10. — *amula turba Notis.*  
 cxii. 10. — *& Euris Sentiet iratis vota nefanda rapi.*  
 cxxv. 1. *Quæ ridet rapidi flabra proterva Noti.*

To all which the *Orig.* gives little or no Countenance.

I make no Doubt, but that in several of the foregoing Examples, it will be thought that I have shew'd myself too severe and hypercritical a Censor of Dr. *Johnston's* Performance. 'Tis very possible this may be true, and that in some Things I have exceeded due Bounds. But, as it is sufficient to my Purpose, that the greater Part of the Remarks I have made in the several foregoing Heads, are well founded, as I am pretty confident they are: Yet you, Sir, have no Reason to complain, who in a manner gave occasion to this Dispute, and have treated *Buchanan* in a quite different manner from that which I have used towards Dr. *Johnston*; whom, notwithstanding these Blemishes, I have taken notice of, and from which even *Buchanan* has not altogether kept himself free, I will always look upon as a great Poet. But it is high Time that I should proceed to the third and last Thing, wherein I was to shew the Superiority the former of these had above the latter in their several Paraphrases, viz.

### S E C T. III.

IN the *poetical Diction*, and *Harmoniousness* of the Verse.

And here, tho' I have join'd these together, because of the great Affinity that is between them; yet it will be convenient to consider them separately. And

I. By *poetical Diction*, I mean a kind of artificial Language, consisting partly of Words and Phrases, invented by, and almost peculiar to Poets: But chiefly in the frequent Use of proper and expressive Epithets, of strong and affecting Figures and Metaphors, of lively and natural



ral Descriptions, and as it were the very Images and Representations of the Things spoken of; with all those agreeable Turns of Wit and Fancy, and all other Ornaments of Language and Thought, which are proper to work upon the Affections of the Reader, and to strike his Mind with Admiration and Delight, which is the chief, if not the sole End of all true Poetry.

This is a rude Draught of what I understand by a *poetical Diction*: But then it is carefully to be considered, that it does not equally take place in all Kinds of *Composition*; but must very much vary in its Degrees, as I shew'd above, according to the different Natures of the Subjects treated of, and that not only in general, but likewise in the several Parts of them. Accordingly I have observed above, that the Writers of *Rhetorick* and *Poetry* have distinguished three different Kinds of Style, the *sublimis*, the *mediocris*, and the *humilis*; each to be made Use as the different Quality of the Matter any Writer is to treat of shall require. But here also there is a Difference between the *oratorial* and *poetical Diction*, that in the same kind of Style, whether the *sublime*, the *middle* or *low*, the Epithets, Figures, and other Ornaments ought not to be so frequent or so strong in *Oratory* as in *Poetry*.

Again, this *poetical Diction* is liable to a considerable Variation from the kind of Verse it is employ'd in. Thus the *Hexameter* or *Heroick*, as also some of the *Lyrick* kind, as particularly the *Alcaick*, is more capable of a lofty and elevated Strain, of bolder and stronger Figures, &c. than the *Jambick*, *Phalucian*, or even the *Elegiack*: Which Diversity, as I said before, render both the one and the other less fit for some Kinds of Subjects.

Besides, what I have said of the *poetical Diction*, and as distinguished from the *oratorial*, or merely *prosaick*; there are two Things that are common to both, or all of them, and that in all the three different Characters, whether the *sublime*, *middle* or *low*, namely, *Perspicuity* and *Purity*. The first of these requires, that what we write be express'd in a distinct, clear and intelligible Manner; and consequently free from all Obscurity, Ambiguity or Perplexed-

plexedness. The second requires, that we abstain from all Words and Phrases, that have not been received into the Language we write in, or are contrary to the established Rules and Customs thereof.

These Things being premised, I come now to apply them, by particularly examining, whether of our two Authors have, in their *poetical Diction*, best observed the foregoing Rules. And here I must own, that I should be very injurious to Dr. *Johnston*, if I did not acknowledge that in general he is possesst of as much of the poetical Talent, of that beautiful Choice of proper and expressive Words and Phrases, of that fine and delicate Use of Epithets, Metaphors, Allusions and other Figures; in short, of all these excellent Ornaments of Wit and Fancy that are requisite to constitute him a great Poet. As to *Buchanan*, I hope there are very few that will refuse him the Honour of the same Accomplishments, and that at least in an equal Degree. I know that you have very different Thoughts of him; but these shall be considered afterwards. In the mean time you'll allow me to set down these Things, wherein he, with respect to the *poetical Diction*, seems, in my Opinion, to have the Advantage over Dr. *Johnston*: And which I reduce to the following Particulars.

(1.) The *First* is, as I noted above, in the Choice of the *Metre*. For that of *Johnston* being all of one Kind, i. e. *Elegiack*, I can hardly be brought to think, notwithstanding all, Sir, you have said to the contrary, that that one Kind of Verse is so well adapted to the great Variety of Subjects that offer themselves in the Book of *Psalms*, as some other Kinds are. Thus, in my Opinion, 'tis scarce possible to preserve that Sublimity and Grandeur that appear in the xviii, xlv, lxxviii, lxxxix and civ *Psalms* in *Elegiack*, or indeed any other Kind of Verse, that they can have in the *Heroick*. For which Reason no Doubt it was, that *Buchanan* made Choice of this last to these *Psalms*, as most proper to answer that End. I might exemplify this in other *Psalms*, done in other Kinds of Verse, which, for Brevity's sake, I omit.

(2.) In many Places the Doctor's Style seems to be  
too

too gay and florid, and not enough suitable to the Gravity and Solemnity (if I may so speak) of the Subject. An Imperfection, which I remember no Instance, wherein Buchanan has not taken particular Care to guard himself against. But it is much otherwise with the Doctor, who seems not to have been insensible of it himself, when in his Preface he apologizes for his undertaking that Work after Buchanan, by telling his Reader, 1<sup>st</sup>, That whoever plunges into the Castalian Streams is mad, and knows not what he is doing. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That King David was to be considered in a double Capacity, viz. both as a King and as a Prophet. That Buchanan had accommodated his Paraphrase to him in the former of these Respects, by preserving all along that Gravity and Majesty, that was suitable to David as a Monarch or Prince. But that he himself having considered him in the latter Respect, had all along cloath'd him in a Garb more corresponding to his prophetic Quality; which being mean and simple, required a Style answering to it. Tho' yet, albeit he does not own it, to render it the more agreeable, he was forced, it seems, to dress it up with some Ornaments of the lower Kind; which is that I call the gay or florid Style. Johnson's Words are these,

*Apta paludato Buchananani est purpura Regi,  
Regibus aut si quid grandius orbis habet.  
Nil mihi cum sceptris, ego do velamina vati:  
Hunc decuit cultu simpliciore tegi.*

And here, Sir, I must beg Pardon to tell you, that in your Conclusion, p. 47, where you are giving us the Substance of his Preface, you seem wilfully to have misrepresented the Doctor's Meaning, by translating the Word VATES, a POET, instead of PROPHET. For I know of no particular Garb worn by Virgil, Horace, or any other Poet, by which they might be differenc'd from other People. But no body is ignorant that these ancient Prophets, as by the Austerity of their Lives, so likewise by the Peculiarity of their Habit, were distinguished from other Persons. That the Doctor is here to be understood



as speaking of *David* as a *Prophet*, not a *Poet*, is farther and clearly manifest from the following *Distich*, wherein he describes the Singularity of the Raiment of *St. John Baptist* and *Amos*; whom every body knows to have been *Prophets*, and not *Poets*:

*Induit Abiades Tyrio pro murice setas,*  
*Seque gregis nivei vellere textit Amos.*

(3.) Much akin to this are the many *flaunting* and *affecting* Ways of speaking to be found in the Doctor's Paraphrase: Some of which I have observed above, under the Head of *Improprieties*. As these are very numerous in the one, and very few in the other, there is scarce any thing in which *Buchanan* seems, to me, to have the Superiority above *Johnston* more than in this Particular. *Quintilian* justly observes, *lib. i. cap. 4.* that *Nihil odiosius est affectatione*. And I am sorry that a Poet, otherwise so excellent as *Dr. Johnston*, should have so frequently laid himself open to that Accusation. And I know no other Apology to be made for it, but that he suffered himself to be too much carried away by the Example of those Authors, who lived after the *Augustan* Age, and who indulged themselves too much in departing from that natural *Plainness* and *Simplicity* which is to be seen in the Works of those that flourished before them. This is that great Fault which *Petronius Arbiter*, and the Author *de causis corruptæ eloquentiæ*, complain so much of in their Time; and of which too many that have lived since, down to our Days, tho' otherwise Persons of singular Abilities, have unwarily suffered themselves to be guilty of. And I am afraid that this *Vice*, (for it really is one) which by the gaudy and glaring Appearance it makes, and by the secret Titillation it is apt to give to the Fancy and Ear, has imposed itself upon whole Ages together for true Beauties and Flowers both of Rhetorick and Poetry, has likewise infected you and the other immoderate Admirers of *Dr. Johnston*; who being (as *Horace* expresses it) *decepti specie recti*, take those Things for real Beauties in him, which, when judiciously

iously examined into, will be found to be but *splendida peccata*, or *fine gilded Blemishes*. But whatever Exceptions may be taken against our *Buchanan* in other Respects, (of which afterwards) yet he is secure against Envy itself on this Head, there being none, since the Restoration of Learning, that has, both in Verse and Prose, preserved so carefully that masculine and elegant *Simplicity*, which we so much admire in those great Masters of Antiquity. And I am hopeful, that in the Sequel of this Discourse, I shall make it appear, that some of these Things which you blame in him as Faults, are so far from being such, that they are a strict Adherence to, and noble Imitation of those best Guides and Patterns of all just Writing.

(4.) I observed above, that besides these Things in which the poetick Style is chiefly concerned; there are other two common to it with Prose, and principal Ingredients in all right Writing of whatever Kind, *viz. Perspicuity and Purity*. As to the *First*, I have little or nothing to object to the Clearness and Plainness of the Doctor's Style; his Sense being in the main, every where, and considered by itself, so obvious and easy to be understood, that hardly any thing can be more. And this he owes chiefly to his being (tho' you dissemble it) a great Imitator of *Ovid*, whose Style of all the *Roman* Poets, (I had almost said Writers) is the most clear and perspicuous. And in this, at first View, he seems to have the Advantage of *Buchanan* himself. But then it is to be remark'd, that I call'd it *Johnston's OWN Sense*, which (as I said) considered by itself, is very plain; whereas, with Respect to that of the *Original*, it is often not so. For that Author's Conciseness in his Translation, (which in the general is praise-worthy) has frequently obliged him to use Expressions that are so loose and vague, that, till we compare it with the original Text, we are at a Loss to find what is the true Meaning of the *Psalmist*. This I have taken Notice above, and proved to have been the Case in a good Number of Instances. Whereas in *Buchanan*, (who did not confine his Paraphrase within such narrow Bounds, as the Doctor, which yet by the by is no Fault) tho' his Expressions are not at first so plain to those

those of lower Capacity, as the Doctor's, yet they, when explain'd and understood, give us a more full and perfect Comprehension of what is in the *Original*, than the Doctor's Words do.

(5.) The *Second* of these two, that are common to all Styles, and the *fifth* and last that I shall mention with relation to that of a good Poet, is the *Purity* of his *Diction*. As to which, I am not without Hopes to make it likewise appear, that in this the Preference is due to *Buchanan*. But, as I aim at nothing but Truth in all this Dispute, I must acknowledge that both the one and the other, as they formed their Style upon the Plan and Imitation of the best *Latin* Writers: So Dr. *Johnston*, in particular, has in the main (and so far as I can judge) preserv'd a due Regard to the *Purity* and *Chastity* of that Language. And that *Buchanan* has done the same, is so well known, that you yourself do not alledge any thing to the contrary. But as no *Copy*, however carefully drawn, can come up to the Perfection of the *Original*; so it is not to be wondred, if they both, as perhaps all others, have sometimes deviated from the primitive Rule. Many Examples of this Sort have been observed by good Criticks, such as *Vossius*, *Vorstius*, *Scioppius*, *Cellarius*, and others, in some of the greatest Authors of the two last Ages, as *Erasmus*, *Lipsius*, *Strada*, both the *Scaligers*, *Salmasius*, *Grotius*, &c. who, tho' otherwise Persons of vast Learning, yet have very often fail'd in the *Purity* of their Language. Several of that Kind I have taken Notice of in *Buchanan*, in Mr. *Freebairn*'s Edition of his Works, Anno 1715, which Mr. *William Lauder*, with some Additions, has repeated; as Mr. *Love* had before him done the like in Dr. *Johnston*'s Paraphrase. But as the *Paper-War* in which these Gentlemen had engaged themselves on the Account of these two Poets, in which they thought their Honour so much concerned, and which, as you write, gave Occasion to your *Supplement* and *Conclusion*, was carried on in such a scurrilous and indecent Manner, that I would willingly avoid intermeddling with that Part of the Controversy, in which however the Main of their *Reasoning*, or rather *Scolding*,



is taken up. Nevertheless, that I may not be thought to overlook any thing that may seem to affect *Buchanan's* Character, or to give his Rival any Advantage over him, I shall, with all the Impartiality I am capable of, fairly set down all the Exceptions that others or I myself have observed can be made, to the *Purity* of the Diction of those two Poets: And then pass the best Judgment I can on the Strength or Weakness of them; still leaving it to others to agree with or differ from me, as their several Opinions shall determine them. And

*First*, As to *Buchanan*, the Exceptions taken against him, as to the Purity of the Language, are of Four Sorts, *1st*, Such as consist of single Words, which are alledged not to be classical. *2dly*, Of Phrases without good Authority. *3dly*, Where the Laws of Prosody are transgress'd. And *4thly*, Where he uses Words, which, tho' good in Prose, are not fit for Poetry.

(1.) Words in *Buchanan* *blam'd*, as not classical.

*Pf.* xxviii. 9. *continuo*, for *continenter*, *assidue*, *usque*.  
 cxlviii. 4. *rotatilis*. lxxviii. 4. *veriloquus*. lxxi. 23.  
*Protektor*. cxlix. 9. *cœlitus*. xlv. 23. *somnolentia*. xxv.  
 13. *affluenter*. vii. 14. *parturiit*. lxxiv. 19. *turturis tuæ*.  
 xlv. 11. *pecus destinata*. vii. 9. *ausus*. xxiii. 4. *pedo*.  
 xxxv. 13. *luis*. li. 14. *Sospitator*. x. 9. *multinodis*. vi. 5.  
*subrutus* for *obrutus*. l. 4. *omniparæ*.

Of these I observe, that *continuo* in the Place cited, as is remarked by Mr. *Hunter*, is or may be taken in its proper Sense for *statim*. That tho' we had no Authority for *rotatilis*, *veriloquus*, *Protektor*, *somnolentia*, *affluenter*, *sospitator*, yet the Analogy of the Language might admit them. But besides, we have *rotatilis* in *Prudentius*: *Protektor* in *Christian* and other Writers: *somnolentus* in *Solinus* and *Apuleius*, and *somnolentia* in *Sidon. Apollinaris*: *affluenter* in *Salinus*, and *affluentius* in *Cicero*: And *sospitator* in *Apuleius*, and on a Coin of the Emperor *Geta*. As to *veriloquus*; *veridicus* and *veriloquium*

*quium* in *Cicero*, seem to justify it: For tho' *Cicero* seems not to be pleas'd with his new coin'd Word *veriloquium*; for *etymologia*, yet that seems rather to have been, because it did not answer to the true Meaning of the Word, than any thing else.

As to *parturit*, tho' we have no classical Authority for it, yet as all Grammarians allow that Preterite, it may pass.

As to *turtur*, *fem.* all the *Latin* Translations agreeing with the *Hebrew* Text there, make it *fem.* and it would, in my Opinion, have been a Fault in *Buchanan*, to have made it *masc.* Besides that Mr. *Burman* observes, that in some MSS. of *Ovid. Amor. ii. 6. 12.* it is read *turtur amica*, and in *Paulinus*, *turtur conjuncta columba*.

*Ausus* also I think may pass; both as it is used by good *Latin* Lawiers, and as we find in good Authors, *jussu* and *jusso*, *sensus* and *senſa*, *eventus* and *eventa*, &c.

As to *pecus*, *fem.* in the Nominative, *pedo* from *pedum* in the Ablative, and *luis* from *lues* in the Genitive, I see no great Harm in them. Some Grammarians allow *pecus pecudis*: Others, that are more strict, deny that it has any Nominative. And the Truth is, that it would seem that the best Authors shun'd it; but for what Reason I know not, unless it was to distinguish it from *pecus pecoris*. That *pedum* should want the Ablative, or *lues* the Genitive, I see no other Cause, but that Grammarians had not met with them in good Authors; tho' I see nothing in the Nature of the Thing that should hinder it.

*Multinodis* may be allow'd both on the Authority of *Apuleius*, and that such Compositions are agreeable to the Laws of Analogy.

*Subrutus*, for *obrutus*, I think of no Importance, nothing being more common with the best Authors than to use one Compound for another; especially since the Nature of the Word is capable of that Sense.

As to *omniparæ*, I own I do not much like it. But whether *terræ omniparentis* in *Virgil*, and *frugiparos fructus* in *Avienus* will justify it, let others determine. Perhaps *Buchanan* may have seen it in some good Author.

And lastly as to *coelitus*, as it is used in a religious Sense, and very frequent in *Christian Writers*, I see no Reason to quarrel it. *Johnston* has it in his *Canticles*, cap. iii. as he has also *coeligenas* and *coeligenis*, *Pf.* cv. 40. and *Pf.* viii. 5. tho' it has no better, and perhaps no other Authority than that of *Apuleius*. But I have no Quarrel with the Word.

(2.) *The Phrases blam'd in Buchanan are,*

*Pf.* l. 9. *Peto te taurum.*] As to which, tho' I have said in my Grammar, that I would not say with the Vulgate, *Luc.* xi. 11. — *patrem petit panem*; yet I will not take upon me to condemn it in *Buchanan*.

xlvi. 1. *Deum pangere praconiis.*] Tho' Mr. *Burman* does not seem to like it, yet Mr. *Hunter*, in his Note on the Place, has, to my Satisfaction, justified this Phrase, both by Authority, and the metaphorical Application of the Word in other Instances.

lx. 10. *Nostros praere exercitus.*] Mr. *Love* has vindicated this Construction, both from Analogy of the Accusative's being put after Verbs of the like Signification, as *praece*do, *prae*curro, *prae*sto, and some others; but also by the unquestionable Authority of *Tacitus*, *Annal.* vi. 20. *Is praibat eum*, &c.

cxix. 100. *Huic quod audiam.*] On this Mr. *Burman* remarks, *An audire alicui defendi possit, vehementer dubito*. But I think I have fully removed that Doubt, by the Example of *Pacuvius ap. Cicer.* and *Apuleius*. Besides, *Johnston* uses that Phrase in this same *Pf.* cxix. 69. *legibus audiens*.

xliv. 22. *Favor in Deum.*] Mr. *Hunter* seems displeas'd with this Phrase; but that is not on the Account of the *Latinity*, (for that is indisputable) but the Impropriety of its being applied to *GOD*; tho', in a certain Sense, even that may pass.

xxii. 16. — *ad instar.*] *Servius* indeed condemns this Phrase, telling us, that *instar non recipit praepositionem*. He owns, however, that *Serenus* uses it. *Vossius* also in his *Etymol.* cites *Solinus* and *Apuleius* for it. *Freinshemius* in



in his *Index in Justinum* seems to approve of it. See *Faber's Lexicon*.

cxxxvii. 3. *Quale canebarus*; for *qualia*.] This is not so bad as it is represented, as we shall shew afterwards.

xliv. 17. *Obruti tot cladibus* ] I believe it should be read *obrutis*. See my *Note* on the *Place*.

i. 22. *De manibus mibi prensa tollat*.] Mr. *Lauder* makes a great Pother with this: But I do not think there is much in it. He would have *Buchanan* to have said *prensos*, because *Persons* are spoke of before. But is it not equally true of *Things*, as well as *Persons*; that when Almighty God seizes or lays hold of them, none can pull them away out of his Hands? The Examples that Mr. *Love* brings to support this way of speaking in *Buchanan*, do not quite come up to the Purpose; yet I doubt not that several may be found parallel to it in good Authors; of which I think that in *Horace* may be one, *Car. i. 34*. 13. *Insignem attenuat Deus Obscura promens*; where, according to Mr. *Lauder*, he should have said *obscurum*, or at least *obscurus*. And like to it is that of *Livy*, *lib. ii. cap. 54*. *Si se commoverit* [Consul] *si respexerit patres; si aliud quam plebem esse in republica crediderit*, &c. which is more elegant; than if he had said *alios*; and is much of a piece with such Phrases as these; *Nihil Ovidio ingeniosius: Nihil Virgilio sublimius*. But what will he think of his and your favourite Author, who, *Pf. liii. 3*. where speaking likewise of wicked Men, as *Buchanan* is here; he says,

*Omnia pestis erant, omnes involverat error:*

*Virque pius toto nullus in orbe fuit:*

not omnes pestis erant?

### (3.) *The wrong Quantities blam'd in Buchanan's Versification are,*

*Pf. civ. 30. denud* with the last Syllable short.] This Dr. *Egleſham* had found Fault with long ago. But Dr. *Barclay* has said a good deal to vindicate *Buchanan* from Blame on that Head. See also what we have said of it, *de metr. Buchan. p. 11*.

xcix. 3. *Salubri* with the penult Syllable short.] *Vossius*, *Muncker* and *Pincier* condemn *Buchanan* for this, and I give it up; for certainly that Syllable ought to be long, as it is in *saluber*. All that can be said for *Buchanan* is, that he seems to have been imposed upon by a wrong reading of a Verse in *Helvius Cinna*, a Poet of the *Augustan* Age, or some little time before it;

*Hostica quod salubrem cuspis haberet opem.*

where in some Copies it is corrected in the Margin, and undoubtedly ought to be read, *celerem*.

lxxxviii. 10. *revocando* with the last Syllable short.] This *Broukhusius*, *Burman* and others condemn. But it is, I think, sufficient to vindicate *Buchanan*, that (as they acknowledge) *Seneca*, *Juvenal* and *Ausonius* (fancying, I suppose, that these *Gerunds* were Parts of a *Verb*, and had nothing to do with *Nouns*) did not stand to shorten that last Syllable. Nay, *Ovid*, in more Places than one, according to some MSS. Copies of him, makes that Syllable *do* sometimes short; as particularly in *Heroid*. ix. 126.

*Fortunam vultus fassa tegendo suos.*

as it is in most Copies both MSS. and printed, which, tho' *Burman* and *Broukhusius* nibble to correct, yet the former, in his Edition of that Author, did not think fit to alter it. Mr. *Love* adds another Example from *Cæsar Germanicus* in his *Aratea*,

*Quem liber ignarum cœli formando docebat.*

*Buchanan* is moreover blam'd, for making the last Syllable of *uti* short in his *Medea*. I believe he is wrong in so doing; but as he has not done it in his *Psalms*, I am the less concerned with it in this Place. However, you may see, if you please, what might probably lead him into that Mistake, in my Treatise *de metr. Buch.* p. 12.

#### (4.) Of Words said not to be poetical in *Buchanan*.

The last Thing quarrell'd in *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, is, that he hath brought into it a great Number of Words that are not poetical, or fit to be used in Verse. Mr.

*Lander*

*Lauder* has in his *Calumny display'd*, Part III. p. 51, mentioned *confiderate*, *Pf.* l. 22. as one of these; and he has told me that he could produce a great many more: You, Sir, in your *Suppl.* p. 11. name *seffor*, *coarguet*, *anfractus*, *dirumpimus*, *demimus*, *conspiratio* and *asseverant*, in the 1st and 3d *Psalms*, as of that Kind. And both of you highly cry out against *canebamus*, in the 137th *Psalms*, as intolerable in Verse. By which, and such others, as you seem yet to have in Reserve, your Taste in these Matters would appear to be so delicate, or rather squeamish, that unless these very Words, in their precise *Cases*, *Tenses*, &c. are literally to be found in approv'd Poets, they are not to be admitted in any modern Verse-composition. This is a very severe Law, and so difficult to be observ'd, that I'm afraid that, as it is much upon the Decay already, so it will bid fair to banish all *Latin* Poetry out of the World. A great Number of the old *Latin* Poets, who perhaps had us'd these very Words that you condemn, are now lost; and of those that remain, there is not one but has several Words, which are not to be found in any other. I will not deny that there may be a great Number of *Latin* Words, that no polite Poem can well admit; and there are also not a few that may very properly be brought into some Kinds of Verse that are not fit for others. Thus in *Iambicks*, as here, *conspiratio*, and *asseverant* may do well enough, tho' perhaps they would not be so agreeable in *Heroicks*: And yet so dull are my Ears, that, as to the Sound of the Words, I can hardly perceive any Difference between *Buchanan's confiderate* and *Virgil's precipitate*: or between *conspiratio* in *Buchanan* and *indignatio* in *Juvenal*. As to *asseverant*, which cannot come into an *Heroick* Verse, what in *Iambicks* is more disagreeable to the Ear in it, than in *improbaturum*, *interminato*, *illiterati*, *exercitatos*, *conviviorum*, *properabantur*, *elaboratum*, *injurious*, &c. in the *Iambicks* of *Horace*. But as I may have Occasion to say something more upon such Words afterwards, I shall only add here, that of all Mortals you should least quarrel *Buchanan* on this Head, since, if you had not been labouring under an invincible Prejudice in Favour of *Dr. Johnston*, you could not but



fee, that he lay much more open to Exceptions of that kind than *Buchanan*, as I shall by and by shew you.

*Secondly*, But I must proceed in the same Order with *Dr. Johnston*, as I did with him, whom you have stated all along as his Rival, and accordingly give that the last Place.

The Exceptions then that have been taken against the Purity of the Doctor's Style, may, as these against *Buchanan*, be reduced to four Heads. *1st*, In Words not classical. *2dly*, In Phrases of the same kind. *3dly*, In Words pronounced against the Laws of Prosody. *4thly*, In such as are, or may be thought not to be, sufficiently poetical.

(1.) *Of Words not classical, or at least not in the Doctor's Sense.*

Of these *Mr. Love* has muster'd up the following. *Pf.* xl. 1. *fulcivit* for *fulsit*. xxxix. 11. and elsewhere, *plecto* for *punio*. v. 10. *reus* for *guilty*. cxix. 59. and cxxxix. 17. *bilanx* for *lanx*. v. 7. *cernuus*, applied by *Virgil* to a Horse, but by *Johnston* to a Man. xxi. 7. *fidit* in the *Preterite* for *fisus est*.

As to these, my humble Opinion is, that some of them are without Foundation, as *reus* for *guilty*; *Mr. Lauder* having shew'd the Word's being used in that Sense by unexceptionable Authors. Others, though not so strictly classical, may be excused by the Example of others, as *fulcivit*, by that of *Pagninus*, *Mollerus*, *Vatablus*, *Beza*, *Dr. Hare*, and probably at first by that of *Buchanan* himself, who, in most Editions printed in his Lifetime, has, *Pf.* xciv. 18. *fulcisset*, with a *c*, which was afterwards, whether by himself or others, changed into *fulsisset*, with an *s*. *Plecto* is not only used by *Buchanan* for *punio*, but is tolerably supported by the Authority of *Prudentius*, who frequently has it in that Sense. Analogy also seems not a little to countenance it, there being nothing more common in the best Authors, than the Passive of that Verb

*plector,*

*plector* its being used for *punior*. Much the same may be said for *bilanx*, as being used by a great many modern Writers, as also by *Martianus Capella*. As to *cernuus*, *Virgil's* Authority is sufficient to vouch it. Whether it may not be applied to a *rational* as well as *irrational* Animal, I see no Reason to doubt: Only I do not like it in that Place of *Johnston*, where it is not, I think, properly enough applied to *K. David's* prostrating himself before God. I know not well what to say of *fidit* in the *Præterite*; the Compound *confidit* I find in that Tense. Grammarians allow the simple *fido*, only *fsus sum*, and not *fidi*: But I do not remember to have seen either the one or the other in good Authors, though Examples are not wanting of the Participle *fsus*.

To these remarked by *Mr. Love*, I add, as observed by me, those others.

*Pf. i. 1. Consilio qui non seductus iniquo.*] *Seductus* not used by any good Author in that Sense. I know, *Mr. Ker*, in his *selectæ de L. L. observationes*, endeavours to justify it; but the Authorities he brings are from faulty Copies. See *Burman* on *Quintilian. Inst. Orat. vii. 2. p. 603*. Whether the Example of *Tertullian*, and other Christian Writers, will make it tolerable, let others determine\*.

*xiii. 3. Optatum mox redde jubar.*] If *mox* is to be taken here for *statim*, *jam*, *nunc*, or any Word signifying the present Time, as the Sense seems to require, I doubt if there is any good Authority for it; the Word, so far as I can remember, always respecting the future. See a late Book, entituled, *Chrestomathia Petronio-Burmanna*, &c. p. 192. If this is a Fault in *Johnston*, as I believe it is, he has fallen into it oftner than once, as *xxv. 16. — desolato mox mihi tende manum. xxxvii. 27. — animi vitiis mox exue. xl. 13. — pede mox properante veni*. If it be said that all Imperatives, with which the *mox* is here joined, do respect the future, then the Word is absolutely superfluous. Besides, I know no Author, that

\* *Mr. Burman* observes, that *Buchanan*, in his *Franciscanus*, v. 32. *Sed si degeneris recti seduceris umbrâ*, has been misled *inquinato Theologorum sermone, ut hoc verbo perperam uteretur*.

joins *mox* with the Imperative. As to that of *Virgil, Æn. xii. 438. Tu facito, mox cum matura adoleverit ætas, Sis memor*; the *mox* is to be coupled with *adoleverit*, not with *facito*, as *Ruens* would have it.

xxvi. 3. — *benefacta putanti.*] For *repntanti.* I doubt if that of *Terence, Rem putemus ipsam*, will justify it.

lxix. 28. *Archivis.*] A Word unknown to the purer *Latin* Ages; I am sure not used by any good Poet.

lxxviii. 57. — *perjuratis avis.*] I doubt much if *perjuratus* for *perjurus* be *Latin.* *Ovid*, I am sure, uses it in a quite different Sense, viz. for *that which one swears by*: *Amor. iii. 11. 22. Turpia quid referam vana mendacia lingue, Et perjuros in mea damna Deos †.*

69. — *coæva.*] The first Poet, or indeed Author, so far as I know, that uses this Word, is *Prudentius*; the Authority alledged for it from *Cicero* seems *spurious.*

cv. 2. *grandifono plectro.*] This bombast Word has no better Authority for it than that of *Sedulius*, who lived probably in the 7th Century, (though the late *Scots* Editors of his *Opus Paschale*, because he is called *Scotus*, would have him to have flourished in the 4th;) and how valuable that is, may be seen by the Word *pompare*, which he has joined with it, *Grandifonis pompare modis*: Though after all I know not but Analogy may bear it out, for we find *ærisona antra*, and *fluctifono profundo*, in *Silius Ital.* *Pallas armifona* in *Virgil*; *multifonum fistrum* in *Statius*; *raucifonos cantus* in *Lucretius*; and *altifoni Maronis* in *Juvenal*; which last this Author has made use of, *Pf. cxliv. 9. altifona lyra*, and *Pf. cv. 4. altifonis modis*, and might have said here with a small Variation, *Altifono Domini miracula tollite plectro.* In Imitation of these, *Paulinus* has ventured to say, *bellifono flumine*, and *hymnifonis choris*; *Arator, doctifonis modis*; *Sidonius, dulcifonum murmur*: None of which I admire.

cxix. 58. *penitis sensibus.*] *Penitus -a -um*, a Word, though used by *Plautus*, yet gone into Desuetude in the purer Ages of *Latinity.*

122. mo-

† 'Tis true, that the same *Ovid* calls the Water of *Stryx*, by which the Gods swore, *imperjurata aqua*, in *Ibin. v. 76. i. e.* which none of them durst swear by falsely. But that I think will not justify *Johnston*.



122. *molester*.] A Word hardly used by good Authors. See *Fabri Lexicon*, and *Cellarii curæ posteriores*.

cxxii. 8. *Concomitata*.] *Plautus* has the Word, but no other good Author, that I know of.

cxxxii. 1. *Cruces*.] For *Troubles* or *Afflictions*. I know the *Lexicons* tell us, that the Word *CRUX* *generaliter pro omni angore, cruciatu atque interitu accipitur*; but the Authorities they bring for it from *Plautus*, *Terence*, *Cicero*, and *Columella*, seem not to come up to the Christian Acceptation of the Word *Crosses*, which it is taken for here.

cxxxix. 23. *Si quid & in tacito forte recludo sinu*.] i. e. If there is any wicked Thought or Design, that is hid, or lurketh in my Heart. The Word *recludo* is here used in a quite contrary Sense to what it is taken in by all good Authors. *Buchanan*, (which I am surpriz'd at) in his Life, uses it in the same Sense that *Johnston* does here, and Mr. *Burman* endeavours, but in vain, as I think, to vindicate it: Besides that it seems absurd, in any Language, that the same Word should have two Significations, quite contrary the one to the other, (as *Perizonius* has observed of *vereor ut* and *vereor ne*, in his Notes on *Sanctius* IV. 15. n. 28. and 29.) besides this, I say, both *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, every where else, use the Word *recludo* for *aperio*, *rebero*, *detego*; the former in *Pf.* xlix. 3. and the latter pretty frequently, as *Pf.* xviii. 15. xxii. 15. li. 15. lxiv. 4. and cvi. 17. None of the best *Lexicographers* do so much as mention the other Signification of the Word.

cxlvii. 1. — *hæc nimium cura decoris habet*.] *Nimium* for *plurimum*. i. e. This Employment has very much of Comeliness in it. Orig. Praise is comely. I know that the Poets use, *nimium felix*, *nimium fortunatus*, *nimium dilectus*, for *valde felix*, &c. but I do not remember to have seen *nimium felicitatis*, &c. for *plurimum* or *valde multum felicitatis*. However, I will not take upon me to condemn it.

I might add to these the Verb *lito*, used in the simple Signification of *sacrifico*, *Pf.* xvi. 4. 1. 5. and cxlv. 10. the true original Signification of the Word being, *Deos amicos & propitios reddere*; whence that of *Plautus*, *Poen.* ii. 41,

ii. 41. *Jupiter faciat ut semper sacrificem, nec unquam litem*: and that of *Martial*, *Epig. x. 73. Non quacunque manu victima caesa litat*: And therefore, according to *Servius*, we ought properly to say, *Deum sacris litare*, and not, *Deo sacra litare*; whence it is, that he blames it as a Novelty in *Virgil* for saying, *Æn. iv. 50. Tu modo posce Deos veniam, sacrisque litatis Indulge hospitio*, when he ought to have said, *Diis litatis*. But *De la Cerda* shews that *Servius* has misrepresented *Virgil* in this Place. However, as *Suetonius*, *Seneca*, not to mention *Tertulian*, have *litare Diti, dolori, & Domino Deo*, simply for *sacrifico*, I will not insist on this, but go to the next Head, viz. of

## (2.) Phrases that may seem exceptionable in Johnstons.

I do not remember any such mentioned by *Mr. Love*, but I have observed, what I think to be of that kind, these following.

*Pf. v. 9. —pectus carnificina mali*] I doubt if *carnificina*, join'd with *mali*, is *Latin* in this Sense.

*lviii. 9. —flammas dum concipis.*] For, while you are kindling a Fire, I am pretty confident not *Latin*. *Concipere ignem* or *flammam* is a very good Phrase, both in Verse and Prose, for, to take Fire; but the *suppositum* to it is always something that is, or supposed to be combustible: And in that Sense here it must signify, that the Person should be set on fire, or be burnt, which is far from the *Psalmist* or *Johnston's* Intention.

*xcix. 3. Plenum formidine numen.*] Here *formido* is used in a passive Sense, for *numen magnopere formidandum*; whether allowable, or justifiable by that of *Horace*, *Furum aviumque Maxima formido*, I have some Doubt.

*ci. 8. —taliam quisquis Suscipit.*] I do not think that *suscipere crimen, culpam*, or the like, is *Latin*.

*cxvi. 11. —video jam vota virorum Pondere destitui.*] I doubt if *vota virorum*, for the Promises or Engagements of Men to assist me, or stand by me, which I take to be the Sense

Sense here [Orig. *All Men are Liars*] is *Latin*.

CXIX. 119. — *diligo sequi*.] I know, *amo loqui, scribere, ludere*, or *sequi*, is good *Latin*; but I am not sure that it is so of *diligo loqui, sequi*, &c.

CXXXIX. I. — *exactâ lustras indagine mores*.] *Indago* properly signifies *Nets* or *Toys*, with which *Woods* or *Parks* are beset round to catch wild *Beasts*; and therefore the Poets I am acquainted with, as *Virgil, Lucretius, Ovid*, say *indagine claudere* or *singere*, but not *lustrare*, that I can find. But, as our Author has the same Phrase in *Cantic. IV. Exsurgo multâque vias indagine lustro*, it is not improbable, but that he has some good Authority for it; or that by a bold *Metâphor* he compares a close and diligent Survey to these *Nets* set by Hunters, so as nothing could escape them.

### (3.) Of Words where the Rules of Quantity are transgress'd.

Of these none occur to me but in two Instances, *viz.* in the Words *monoceros* and *myticoracis*. In the former of these Dr. *Jobnston* has been obliged by his Verse to make the first Syllable long, that naturally is short, as in *Pf. xxii. 21.* and *xxix. 6.* but this he has done in Imitation of the *Greeks*, who have, in some such Words as these, changed the *o micron* into *ε*, or (according to the *Doric* Dialect) into *ω mega*. Thus we find *μᾶνος* for *μόνος*, *Πηλιδάμας* for *Πολυδάμας* in *Homer*; and *μυνογενής*, *μυνομήτωρ*, *μυνο*, in other Authors, for *μονογενής*, *μονομήτωρ*, *μονο*; and particularly *μυνοκέρα*, *unicornia*, apud *Hesychium ex Archilocho*. Thus likewise *Horace* makes the first Syllable in *Polypus* long, because the *Greek* used sometimes *πολύπες*, *πελύπες*, and *πωλύπες*: And *Ovid* makes the first in *coralium* long, which *Claudian* makes short, because the *Greek* said *κοράλλον*, *κεράλλον*, and *κωράλλον*. In some Copies of *Ovid* it is read *curalium*. As to *Polydamas* in that Author, as also in *Propertius, Persius* and *Silius Italicus*, the Commentators are much divided, whether we should read it *Polydamas* or *Pulydamas*?



*mas*: *Egnatius*, *Parrhasius* and *Broukhusius* are for the latter: *Dausquius* and *Drakenborch* for the former. *Nic. Heinsius* is inconstant in his Opinion: On *Ovid*, *Her.* v. 94. he is for *Polydamas*, telling us that all the MSS. of the Authors above named read it so; but on *Met.* xii. 547. he would have it written, *Pulydamas*; and yet again, (as *Drakenborch*, on *Sil. Ital.* xii. 212. informs us) he corrected it *Pulydamas* on the Margin, but afterwards dash'd it out. But, to return to *Johnston*, I know not whether it was well done in you to read *monoceros* and *monocerota*, when all the former Editions have *munoceros* and *munocerota*.

The other Word is in *Pf.* xcii. 6. — *oculos nycticoracis habet*; where the penult Syllable is made long, which should be short: For *κόραξ* has *κόρακος*, penult. correptâ, as in *Homer's Odyss.* N. v. 408. So *Buchanan*, in his *Franciscanus*, v. 324. Ἐς κόρακος, which he had from *Aristophanes*. But I doubt if the same Excuse will pass for this, as for the former, viz. that both *monoceros* and *nycticoracis* having three short Syllables together, it was impossible to bring them into either *Hexameters* or *Pentameters*, without making one of these Syllables long: For he might have called it *noctua*, or, as *Ovid*, and he himself, *Pf.* cii. 6. *noctis avis*.

#### (4.) Of Words in Johnston that seem not fit for Poetry.

Of these Mr. *Love* reckons up *techna*, *typhus*, *seminium*, *Lerna*, *combinans*, *sequestratum*, *segrege* and *segregis*, *pistrix*, *aritermus*, *nomenclatura*. But, as to most of these, he seems more to be offended with the Words their being somewhat unusual, than with the *Unpoeticalness* (if I may so speak) of them. That some of these are of the *basse Latinité* must be owned, such as *typhus*, *combinans*, and *sequestratus*, which have no better Authority than that of *Christian Writers*, at least such as lived in what is called the *Brazen Age*. Others again are indeed not very usual, at least in Poetry; as *techna*, to be found however in  
*Plantus*

*Plautus* and *Terence*, *aviterius* in *Varro*, *nomenclatura* in *Pliny*. As to *Lerna*, *seminium*, and *pistrix*, I see no Reason for finding Fault with them, all of them being used not only by Prose, but Verse Writers, of the best Authority. *Segrege* also may pass, as being used not only by *Prudentius* in several Places, and *Sidonius Apollinaris*, but also by *Seneca*.

There are some others that I have observed, which, though I will not absolutely condemn as unfit for Poetry, yet I will be so bold as to affirm, that they are more so, than any of these Words against which you and Mr. *Lauder* take Exception in *Buchanan* on that account: Not to mention that some of those noted by you are used in *Iambicks*, which allow several Words that would not be proper in *Heroicks* or *Elegiacks*. These then of that Kind that have occurred to me in *Johnston* are:

*Pf.* xiii. 3. *Retrospectans*.] A Word that has not only a Sound somewhat disagreeable, but is not to be found in any classical Dictionary.

*Ixix.* 21. *Intricabar*.] Sounds not very poetically, tho' *intricata*, *ibid.* v. 2. may do well enough, as *Horace* has *extricata*, *Carm.* iii. 3. 5. 31.

*Ixxviii.* 52. *Perdus & pernox*.] I question if the first of these is to be found in any Poet. *Gellius* is the first that I have observed to have used it even in Prose, and probably it is from him *Johnston* has borrowed the Phrase, *ii.* 1. *Stare solitus dicitur Socrates pertinaci studio perdus & pernox*.

*Ixxxi.* 1. *O quibus illiciis*.] *Illiciis* not a poetical Word, and hardly to be found in any good Author but *Varro*, and that, for ought appears, only once. *Johnston* had done better, if he had us'd the Word *illecebris*, as he does, *Pf.* cxxxi. 1. *O quibus illecebris*!

*cxlviii.* 12. *Decrepitusque senex*.] *Decrepitus*, a Word used indeed by *Cicero* and others, but never in Verse that I know of, by good Poets, either *Hexameter* or *Pentameter*.

*Ixxiv.* 6. *Calaturæ*.] A Word good enough in Prose, but whether so in Verse, I have some small Doubt; as I had also concerning

vii. 3. *Clan-*

vii. 3. *Clandestini*.] Which I thought once not so proper to be used by a Poet, till I found it in *Sil. Ital.* vii. 267. *Ceu clandestino traheretur fœdere bellum* \*.

To these I might add *Archivis*, *coeva*, and *molester*, noted above p. 72. and 73. as not having classical Authority, and therefore less proper in *Latin Verse*.

I have now very fully, I think, reckoned up all the Objections, to which, in the Judgment either of others or of myself, the *Poetical Style* of our two great Poets may any ways seem liable; and have, as fairly and impartially as I could, given my Opinion concerning every one of them, leaving it at the same time free to all Persons of Ingenuity to approve or disprove my Sentiments, as to them shall appear most reasonable. Upon the whole however, I will adventure (till I am taught otherwise) to conclude, that though both of them *suos passî sunt manes*, yet *Buchanan paucioribus vitis argetur*, and consequently in this Respect ought to have the Preference to Dr. *Johnston*.

#### S E C T. IV.

II. I Come now to the SECOND Branch of the Third Article, in which these two Authors were to be compared with one another, viz. the *Harmoniousness* of their Verse. But here, as the one has used a great Variety, and the other confin'd himself to almost one Kind only, it is hardly possible to institute throughout a just Comparison between them: For it is, I think, agreed among all that have writ on the Subject of *Verseification*, that what, with respect even to the Numbers, is a Beauty in one kind of *Metre*, is not so, but often the contrary, in others. Thus the *Heroick* admits of frequent Elisions, and other Asperities, which would be disagreeable in *Elegiacks*. Thus, in most kinds of Verse, it is more pleasant and harmonious to the Ear, that the Feet and the Words be as it were chain'd

---

\* And this (by the by) ought to be a Caution to you and me, as well as to others, not to be hasty in passing our Censures upon any Author, without due Examination.



chain'd to one another, and not that they both end together: Whereas in *Anapaesticks* it is quite otherwise; for in them it is reckoned a Beauty, that there be no *Cesures*, or Parts of Words remaining, after the Feet are ended; As in these of *Seneca*, in *O Edip.* v. 980.

*Fatis | agimur, | cedite | fatis.*

*Quicquid | facimus, | venit ex | alto.*

*Omnia | certo | tramite | vadunt.*

Not to mention other *Virtues* and *Vices*, which in different Sorts of Verse do variously take place\*. The only Comparison therefore that can justly be made betwixt *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, is in those Parts of their Works, which are compos'd in the same kind of Verse. Now, as in the Doctor's Paraphrase, all the *Psalms* (except the cxix.) are done in *Elegiacks*, and in that of *Buchanan* only three, viz. the lxxxviii. the cxiv. and the cxxxvii. in that kind of Verse; we have but a narrow Field to go upon, whereby the Advantage on either Side, with respect to the whole, may be clearly discerned.

You indeed, Sir, have been at some Pains to prove, that the Doctor has the Superiority over *Buchanan* in the last of these *Psalms*, as well as in some others of another Kind; and that, as in other Respects, so particularly in the Musicalness of the Numbers. But, because the Instances you there bring of *Buchanan's* Failure in that Point, will come more naturally under the *Second* Head of this Dispute, wherein I am to consider, by themselves, all the Exceptions, of whatever kind, which you make against *Buchanan's* Performance; I shall put off the particular Discussion of them till then. All that I think incumbent upon me in this Place is, after having spoken a little in the general of the *Harmoniousness* of Verse, and how far to be carried by a judicious Poet, that I enter into a Detail of those several things in which you will have it to consist; and to shew that, notwithstanding all your Pretensions

---

\* Among these I might observe, that it is reckoned a very gross and hardly tolerable Fault in the *Elegiack Pentameter* Line, when the *Penthemimeres*, or *Cesure* after second Foot, is wanting. As, on the contrary, it is no less a Fault in the long *Odonarian Trochaicks*, to have a *Cesure* after 4th Foot.

versions to the contrary, you have no Reason to give the Preference to *Johnston* before *Buchanan* in any one of them.

As to the *Harmoniousness* of Verse in general, I must frankly own, that, with respect to the *Numbers*, there can be nothing more charming, more exquisite and delightful, than what runs through the Doctor's Paraphrase. But then, as there is nothing that cannot be carried to Excess; so I believe that he has, in several Instances, gone beyond due Bounds, as to that Particular; and that, for the Sake of that delicate Smoothness and Fluency which he has so much studied, he sometimes becomes *soft* and *effeminate*, and falls short of that *Strength* and *Dignity*, which the Subject calls for \*. This, as I have said before, is in a great measure owing to the *Elegiack* kind of Verse he has chosen; the natural and almost essential Property whereof is to be of a soft and easy Strain; whence by the Poets they are called *molles*, *leves*, *blandi* and *imbelles Elegi*.

As to *Buchanan*, there is none, I suppose, who knows what true Poetry is, that will deny him to have been possessed of as much of Musical Fluency and Melodiousness in his Numbers, as any of the Age he lived in, or since, so far as the Subject treated of, and the Kind of Verse he employed, did admit or require. And if at any Time he may seem not to give that grateful Titillation to the Ear that the Doctor does, it did not proceed from any Defect of his Genius, but from the Judiciousness of his Choice; which disposed him to avoid or neglect all such artificial Embellishments, as might appear to enervate the Strength of his Sentiments, rather than beautify and adorn them. In this he has imitated the great Prince of *Latin* Poets, whose almost peculiar Excellency it was, to model his Versification to his Subject, and not his Subject to his Versification. It is a just Rule, and which ought strictly to be observed in all good Writing, whether in Prose or Verse, that is laid down by

\* Here especially that Rule of St. *Augustin* ought to take place: *Cavendum ne divinis gravibusque sententiis, dum additur numerus, pondus detrahatur.*

by *Corradus*, in his learned Treatise *de ling. Lat.* p. 478. *Prior cura ac diligentia sententiarum, secunda fit verborum, tertia componendæ orationis*: Or, as that great Master of true Eloquence, *Quintilian*, much to the same purpose, expresses it, *Instit. orat. lib. i. cap. 4. Omnis oratio tres habet virtutes, ut emendata, ut dilucida, ut ornata sit*; where, though the *Sentiment* is not mentioned, yet we must suppose it to be understood: As it is likewise more than probable, that under *Composition*, in *Corradus*, is contain'd that grateful Sound, that the Words when put together give to the Ear. This however is certain, and agreed upon by all, that this Agreeableness of Sound, which we call *Harmony*, is but an accessory Ornament to Language, and though, where that, and the principal and essential Ingredients of Speech can stand together, it is by no means to be neglected; yet, wherever they happen (as they frequently must) to clash and interfere with one another, this external Property ought to give place to those internal and more necessary ones, and upon that account be more sparingly used, and sometimes laid quite aside. Thus, not to mention others, in the incomparable *Virgil*, we will meet with a great Number of Verses, which, if the Ear only was to be consulted, seem rough and disagreeable; but when we consider the Fiteness and Correspondence of them to the Sentiments he there design'd to express, we shall see that they much better answer that End, than if they had run more smoothly and harmoniously. And this can be ascribed to no other Cause, but to the exquisite Judgment of that exalted Poet. Of such Verses that sound harshly in him, take the few following Examples.

*Verum hæc tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes.*  
*Verum id quod multo tute ipse fatebere majus.*  
*Nec sum adeo informis, nuper me in littore vidi.*  
*Id quidem ago, & tacitus, Lycida, mecum ipse revolvō.*  
*Omnes, unde amor iste, rogant, tibi? Venit Apollo:*  
*Scilicet omnibus labor est impendendus, & omnes.*  
*Quatuor hic, primum omen, equos in gramine vidi:*  
*Et cum frigida mors animā seduxerit artus.*



*Ardens limitem agit ferro: te, Turne, superbum.\**

To which may be added, *Æn.* iii. 697.

*Jussi numina magna loci veneramur: & inde.*

where, as *Scaliger*, *Poet.* iv. 48. observes, if he had only regarded the Fluency of the Verse, he might have said,

*Numina magna loci jussi veneramur——*

And in like manner, in that, *Æn.* vii. 724.

*Curru jungit Halesus equos, Turnoque feroces;*

he might, as is noted by the same Author, *ibid.* have said, *Jungit Halesus equos curru.*—— So in these Verses which end with Monosyllables, and are therefore condemn'd as ungrateful to the Ear by *Servius*, but are notwithstanding highly admired by most others, such as,

*Sternitur, exanimisque tremens procumbit humi bos.*

*Dat latus, insequitur cumulo præruptus aquæ mons;*  
had he studied nothing but Sound, he could, as the same *Scaliger*, *ibid.* observes, have written,

*Sternitur, exanimisque tremens bos corruiet ictu; And,*

*Dat latus, insequitur tumidis mons incitus undis:*

But he has done incomparably better, by closing his Verse with a Monosyllable, and thereby setting, as it were, before our Eyes, the very Images of the things he is describing, which no other Numbers could have so justly represented. And no doubt he had the same Reason in the Verses above mentioned, which, to those that are taken with out-side Beauties, may appear less agreeable and harmonious.

I hope no one will here mistake me, as if I thought that *Virgil* paid little Regard to these external and less essential Ornaments of Poetry: So far from it, that, on the contrary, I believe there never was, or probably ever will be, a Poet, that made a more excellent Choice, or a bounded

---

\* *Bernardinus Parthenius Spilimbergius*, in his most ingenious and elegant Treatise, *de poetica imitatione*, edit. Venet. 1565. 4to, p. 121. has observed several such Lines in *Lucretius*, as,

*Naribus, auribus, atque oculis orisque sapor.*

*Fulmen detulit in terras mortalibus igne.*

*Denique ab ignibus ad gelidas hyemisque pruinas, &c.*

And then adds: *Varietatis tamen causâ, nonnunquam tali in numero connivendum putamus, quoniam id variis in locis etiam à Virgilio factum non reprehendimus, ut, Jussi numina magna Deum veneramur——.*

bounded with a greater Number or Variety of them, than he. But herein lay the Art of this matchless Author, that he never suffer'd himself to be carried away with them, so as to neglect what was more material in his Poems; but applied them sometimes one Way, sometimes another; here in greater Abundance, there more sparingly; and sometimes laid them aside altogether, when the Nature of what he was describing made it proper for him to do so.

This might in some measure have sufficed to be spoken concerning the *Harmoniousness* of the Numbers in these our two *Scottish* Poets. But, because you have enlarg'd so much on that Head, as if the very *Soul of Poetry* consisted chiefly in it, it will probably be expected by my Reader, that I should more particularly consider the several Excellencies of *Virgil's Versification*, which (as you would have the World believe) *Johnston* has so happily imitated, and *Buchanan* has come so much short of.

These then (*Pref. Dist. p. 30.*) you reduce to the eleven following Heads.

1. The continual varying of the Pause.
2. The Inversion of the Phrase.
3. The adapting the Sound to the Sense.
4. The mixing of the singular and plural Numbers.
5. The giving Majesty and Strength to his Verse, with the connecting Particles *que* and *et*.
6. The *collocatio verborum*, or artful Way of placing Words.
7. The changing the common Pronunciation of Words.
8. Verses contrary to the common Measure.
9. 10. and 11. His *Alliteratio*, *Allusio verborum*, and *Affonantia syllabarum*.

It would be a very laborious, as well as irksome Task, to go through every one of these minutely: But that if may not be said, that for the Sake of *Buchanan's* Reputation I industriously pass them over, I shall take some Notice of each of them, and shew, as briefly as I can, that there is no Ground for attributing the Superiority to *Johnston* above *Buchanan*, in any of these Particulars.

But, before I proceed, I must in general premise, that the far greater Part of them may be reduced to one general Head, viz. that admirable *Variety* that runs thro' all *Virgil's Works*; in which (not to mention his other *Excellencies*) he vastly surpasses all other Poets, *Greek* and *Latin*, antient and modern, that ever wrote. This is so remarkable, that there is hardly a Verse in him, that has not something to distinguish it from that which went before, either in the Disposition of the Feet, the Number and Place of the Cæsures, the Length or Shortness of the Words, the Use or Omission of the Elisions, the frequent Alliterations, Assonancies of Syllables, with a great many other things too tedious to be here mentioned. Nay to this beautiful Variety, which (according to *Jul. Scaliger*, in the Place above cited) *poeticarum omnium virtutum maxima est*, are owing (says that noble Author) these seemingly unpolished Verses, which we meet with in *Virgil*; such as, —*omnium egenos,—sic nam fore bello,—Ille ubi matrem,—Hector ubi ingens.*

*Ille autem expirans; non me, quicunque es, inulto, Victor, nec longum letabere: te quoque fata, &c.*

These being (as he expresses it) *condimenti atque intinctus loco habenda*. To this same unbounded Variety may be attributed the several uncommon, and some of them in Appearance *solæcistical* Ways of speaking, in that majestic Writer; for which, *Mr. Dryden* says, he would need a particular Grammar by himself.

But, to come to the several *Articles* above-mentioned:

I. The first is, *The Varying of the Pause*. As to which you tell us, that you had fallen upon an *Expedient* to understand that Matter, which none had sufficiently explain'd before. And what is this *Expedient*, but what all that are tolerably conversant in *Latin* Poetry are well acquainted with; namely, that the common *Pause* or *Stop* in *Heroick* Verse is upon the first Syllable of the third Foot? of which you give us for Examples eight Lines in the beginning of *Ovid's Metamorphosis*.

*Ante mare & tellus, &c.*

All which, you observe, are paused in the same Place, except one (the 4th;) and you add, that in this Kind of  
Mea-



*Measure the Metamorphosis is generally written.* That you have brought your Examples from *Ovid*, was, among other things, to show the low Opinion you have of that Author. But you might have fetcht them as well from any other Poet, nay from the great *Virgil* himself. For in the Beginning of his *Æneid*, the most glorious of all his Works, you have also eight Lines all paused on the first Syllable of the 3d Foot, and no Alteration made in that Matter till the 9th Line, where the Pause falls upon the first Syllable of the 4th Foot:

*Arma virumque cano, | &c.*

*Quidve dolens regina Dehm. |*

And, upon Trial, it will be found, that the Difference betwixt *Virgil* and *Ovid* is very inconsiderable throughout all their Works, as to this Particular, as I shall shew afterwards.

You indeed, to make the Difference betwixt *Ovid* and *Virgil's* Versification, as to this Article, appear very great, have fallen upon a new Way of pausing the Verse of this last, namely, by causing your Pauses to depend, not so much upon the *Cæsures* after any of the three or four first Feet, nor upon the interchangeable Mixture of the Feet themselves, (which is reckoned one of the chief Beauties in *Heroick* Verse) but either on the Bulk or Length of the Words of which the Verse is composed; or, which seems more probable, on the *Respirations* or *Stops* of the Breath, that are necessary to distinguish the *Clauses* of *Sentences* from one another. According to this Rule, in the first *Georgick*, you pause the five first Verses thus:

*Quid faciat letas segetes, | quo fidere terram*

*Vertere, | Macenas, | ulmisque adjungere vites,*

*Conveniat, | quæ cura boum, | qui cultus habendo*

*Sit pecori, | apibus quanta experientia parcis,*

*Hinc canere incipiam. | ———*

And you add, " That this great Master has artfully avoided the common Pause, till he come to the fifth Line; and that he takes Care to do it as much as possible throughout the whole Work." Here it seems plain, that you make the Pause fall on these Places where

the Parts or Members of a Sentence are distinguished from one another, viz. in the first Line one Pause, at *segetes*: In the second, two; one at *vertere*, and another at *Mecenas*: In the third, two; one at *conveniat*, and another at *bonum*: And in the 4th, one at *pecori*. In all which the Sense requires that Stop in the pronouncing, which we call a *Comma* or *Colon*. This is the Way you take in pausing these Verses of *Virgil*; but when you come to speak of Dr. *Johnston*'s varying the Pause, you seem to go by another Rule: For, p. 44. you tell us, that the 5th, 6th, and 8th Distichs (I suppose you mean the *Hexameter* Lines in these Distichs,) are the only Verses that are in the common Pause; but that the other six are all very artfully varied. I wish you had marked the Places of these Pauses in *Johnston*, as you have done in *Virgil*; for, without that, I frankly own that I am much at a Loss how to form an Idea of them. All that I can discover is, that you seem in them not to regard the Stops or *Interpunctions* made for the Sense, but the accidental Length or Shortness of the Words: For in the four first *Hexameters* of *Johnston* you will have the Pause varied from the common Way; if so, they must be paused thus:

*Felix, | consilio |*

*Nec quibus | impietas: |* Or, *Nec quibus | impietas in-*  
*sistit. |*

*Mente sed | aetherei. |*

*Arboris | in morem, |* Or, *Arboris | in morem surget. |*

In all which there must be (according to you) two Pauses in each of these Verses, unless you will have it lost at the Place where it is most common and most manifest, i. e. at the *Cesure* after the second Foot. And if in these the common Pause is not to take place, I would ask, whether, in the Line, *Felix, consilio qui nec seductus iniquo*, we are to have any Pause besides that at *felix*? and if we are to have one or two more, and none is to be put after *consilio*, where is it, or they, to be put? Again, in the Line,

*Mente sed aetherei meditatur jussa parentis.*

As there is no Stop in the Sense, I would fain know, (if  
the

the Pause is not to be the *common* one at *atherei*) upon what other Word or Words does it fall?

But further, and to deal plainly with you, I cannot for my Heart perceive, why in the first two Lines of *Buchanan*, which, in your *Supplement*, p. 17. you say are *paused*, and not very happily, in the *common Manner*, there may not be a Pause after *Felix*, in *Felix ille animi*, as well as in the Doctor's *Felix | consilio*; or after *Impia*, in *Impia | sacrilegæ*; as well as after *Nec quibus* in *Nec quibus | impietas*: Unless it lies in this, that in the former in *Buchanan*, we have after the Word *felix* two Words, *ille animi*; and in *Johnston* only one, *consilio*: And in the latter the Pause in *Buchanan* is or may be put after one Word, *impia*; and in *Johnston* after two, *nec quibus*, or if you will, after the *nec*. If this is the Way the Pauses are to be accounted for in these Poets, I entirely give them up, as to me utterly unintelligible. The Notion that I have of these Pauses is pretty plain, and may be reduced to the three following Heads.

1. That in *Prose*, as well as *Verse*, there ought to be some little *Halt* or *Mora* at the Pronunciation of every Word, otherwise we could not well distinguish them from one another. And something of this must even appear, where the last Syllable is cut off by *Elision*: For I can hardly believe, that the old *Romans* pronounced the Words where these took place, as if there were no such Syllables in them, viz. that they would say, *Littora, mult ille*, instead of *multum ille*; or, *Phyllid am ant alias*, instead of, *Phyllida amo ante alias*. All they did, I suppose, was to pronounce these Syllables very quick, that the *hiatus* might be little observed. \*

F 4

2. In

---

\* The *Greeks*, who had no other *Elision*, but that of the *Synalæpha*, or Vowel before a Vowel, differ'd from the *Latins* in this, that they could leave out or keep in the Vowel, as they pleas'd; and when they design'd that it should be elided, they put the Mark called *Apostrophus* in Place of it, in which Case certainly it was not to be pronounced. And probably the most ancient *Romans* did the same; whence perhaps it is, that we have so many Verses in *Virgil* where that *Elision* is neglected; which Freedom the Poets that came after (unless it was in *Greek* proper



2. In my Opinion, this Pause or Stop was something greater after the *Clauses* or Members of a Sentence, and greatest of all at the Period or Conclusion of it. And,

3. When any Word was to be pronounced with a greater *Emphasis* or *Pathos* than the rest. For these Words being to be utter'd with a higher Elevation of the Voice, there will necessarily happen some larger *mora* or Delay, before it is brought low again to the ordinary *Tone*. All these take place in a great Measure in all Languages, both in Prose and in Verse.

But as to the particular Pauses in Verse, with which alone we are here concerned, it is moreover observable, that most Verses, as well *heroick* as others, naturally divide themselves into two *Hemistichs* or *Halves*, in which, besides the Pauses above mentioned, the greatest *Stop* is at the End, and, next to that, at the Middle, thus:

*Arma virumque cano, | Trojæ qui primus ab oris.* Hex.

*Nil mihi rescribas, | attamen ipse veni.* Pentam.

*Mæcenas atavis | edite Regibus.* Asclep.

*Fam satis terris | nivis atque diræ.* Sapph.

*Vides ut altâ | stet nive candidum.* Alcaic.

*Passer, deliciæ | mæx puellæ.* Phæleuc.

*Beatus ille, | qui procul negotiis.* Iamb.

*Audiat omnis, | pontus & æther.* Anapæst.

*Perdidi Musam tacendo, | nec me Phæbus respicit.*

[ Troch.  
As

per Names) very rarely allow'd themselves. As for the *Eclipsis*, or *Elision* of the Syllable ending in *m* before a Word beginning with a Vowel, *Ennius*, and perhaps some others in his Time, sometimes, tho' very rarely, omitted it; but never others that came after, that I know of. It is besides remarkable, that in many Editions of the Remains of *Ennius*, *Lucilius*, and other Poets before the *Augustan* Age, particularly in *Plautus*, *Terence*, and *Lucretius*, where the Word *est* is preceded by a Word ending with a Vowel, the Vowel *e* in *est* is elided, or marked with an *Apostrophus*, and not the Vowel of the preceeding Word; as, —*si res bene gesta 'st*, for *gesta est*; in which I shall suppose that the Letter *s*, which in those ancient Times was also sometimes elided before a Consonant for the Verse sake, was for that Reason not pronounced. However that be, I cannot easily persuade myself, that the Explosion of Syllables ending in *m* in Scanning, made that Syllable be dropt in the Pronunciation,

As to the other Pauses in any of the two *Hemistichs*, they are seldom so great as at the *Hemistichs* themselves, and they are generally diversify'd by the Length or Shortness of the Words, and (in *Heroicks* especially) by the various Mixture of the *Dactyles* and *Spundees* together. And to these are chiefly owing the Distinctions that are made by *Grammarians* of the *Cæsures*, (which, as your *Erythræus*, in his Treatise *de licent. & diligent. carm. Virg. p. 55.* are otherwite called *Mansiones*, *Incisiones*, *Articuli*, *Sectiones* and *Commata*) into the *Trithemimeres*, *Penthemimeres*, *Hepthemimeres* and *Enneemimeres* †; by which they understand the Syllable that remains after the first, second, third and fourth Foot. Now the chief Pauses in *heroick Verse* commonly lights upon these; and the Verse is generally more or less grateful, as it hath more or fewer of these *Cæsures* in them: As in that of *Virgil*, where they all four occur;

*Ille latus niveum molli fultus hyacintho.*

And in that,

*Fudit equum magno tellus percussa tridentii,*

where we have the first three. And in that,

*Inde toro pater Æneas sic orsus ab alto,*

where we have only two. And there are a great Number of excellent Verses in *Virgil*, where few of these *Cæsures* are to be met with, and sometimes, tho' very rarely, where there is only but one; as,

*Magnanimi Jovis ingratum ascendere cubile.\**

Nay, which is extremely rare in that Author, and in most others, where there is no *Cæsure* at all, as these noted by *Erythræus*, p. 61.

*Arcades, ô mihi tum quàm molliter ossa quiescant.*

*Scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus, & omnes.*

*Et bibit humorem, & cum vult, ex se ipsa remittit.*

which, tho' they sound a little harshly to the Ear, yet we are not to think that that great Author used them without some

† *Capperonius*, in his Notes on *Quintilian*, has shew'd that we should so name them, not *Trithemimeris*, *Penthemimeris*, &c. as they are commonly call'd.

\* For the *tum*, or last Syllable in *ingratum* is absorpt by the first in *ascendere*.

some Reason. However, as it is certainly a Fault, to have every Foot, not only without a *Cesure*, but also made up of an entire Word, as in that of *Ennius*,

*Romæ moenia terruit impiger Hannibal armis.*

I know no good Poet that has since fallen into it.

But to return to our Purpose, as the chief Pause in *heroick Verse* is, (next to that at the End) that which falls in the *middle*, or after the first *Hemistich*; so the most remarkable Variety, as to that Pause, is when it either happens to light on the *common Penthemimeres*, or on that which they call the *Penthemimeres trochaica*. The first is, when after the second Foot, there remains one Syllable of the Word only, which, by the Nature of the Verse, must always be or become a long one. The second is, when after that second Foot, there remain two Syllables, of which the one is long and the other short, *i. e.* they make a *Trochee*, whence it had its Name. In the former of these, the *common* Pause, as you call it, takes place, that is, it falls upon the first Syllable of the third Foot; or, which is the same thing, on the Syllable remaining after the second Foot, as in

*At Regina gravi | jamdudum saucia cura.*

In the latter it falls upon the first Syllable of the fourth Foot, or, which is the same, on the Syllable remaining after the third Foot, as in

*Quidve dolens Regina Deum | tot volvere casus.*

In this latter Pause it often happens that what they call the *Penthemimeres trochaica*, is a whole Word, as in that of *Ovid*,

*Nec quicquam nisi pondus iners, | congestaque eodem.*

Now, as I said, the most remarkable of the Pauses, being that which divides the first *Hemistich* from the second, the only Variety that can there happen is, when it falls on the Syllable next after the second Foot, or on the Syllable next after the third. The most beautiful of these two Pauses is generally this last; but as there can be no Beauty without Variety, so if this Pause were kept up in every Verse, or even used too frequently, it would, for that Reason, become nauseous and disagreeable. The Art then of the Poet, as to this Particular, must be

to



to intermix these Pauses here and there with one another. But as to the Proportion of this Mixture, no Rule can be given; therefore Poets have taken to themselves an unbounded Freedom in it, using it in more or less Degrees, as the Nature of the Subject, the Justness of the Sentiments, the Choice of proper Words or Expressions, and other accidental Circumstances did determine them. 'Tis true, that in them all the *common* Pause at the Syllable after the second Foot is most frequent, and the other after the third Foot is by some Poets oftner, by others more rarely made use of. And in this there is some Difference between *Virgil* and *Ovid*, the *Penthemimeres Trochaica*, or Stop after the third Foot, being less frequent in the latter than in the former. But then that Difference is far from being so great, as you would make us believe. I have taken the Pains to compare the first Book of the *Georgicks* of the one with the first Book of the *Metamorphosis* of the other; and find that the Use of the *Penthemimeres Trochaica* in those great Poets stand thus:

## In OVID's

1st 100 Lines	} it occurs {	10 times.
2d 100 Lines		8 times.
3d 100 Lines		14 times.
4th 100 Lines		12 times.
5th 100 Lines		9 times.
6th 100 Lines		13 times.
7th 100 Lines		10 times.
last 79 Lines		5 times.

In all 81 times.

And these besides two Lines, where one of the two remaining Syllables is swallowed up by a *Synalæpha*, viz.

160. *In faciem vertisse hominum.* | —

721. *Extinctum est centumque oculos.* | — And

190. *Cuncta prius tentata, sed immedicabile vulnus,*  
where we have no *Cæsura* but after the first Foot.

In

## In VIRGIL's

1st	100 Lines	} it occurs {	8 times.
2d	100 Lines		10 times.
3d	100 Lines		11 times.
4th	100 Lines		14 times.
5th	100 Lines		10 times.
last	14 Lines		1 time.
			<hr/> 54 times.

And these besides Ver.

357. *Incipiunt agitata tumescere, | & aridus altis,*  
where we have no *Cæsura* (I mean of one Syllable) but  
after Foot first. And

320. *Sublime expulsam eruerent: | ita turbine nigro.*

340. *Extrema sub casum hyemis | jam vere sereno.*

399. *Dilecta Thetidi Halcyones: | non ore solutos.*  
where the *Cæsura* after second Foot is elided.

From this Comparison it appears that the Pause on the  
first *Hemistich* in *Ovid's* first *Metamorph.* falls after Foot  
third 81 times, and in *Virgil's* first *Georgick* only 53 times.  
But because there are 265 Verses more in that Book of  
*Ovid* than in that of *Virgil*, I shall take the Proportion as  
it stands betwixt these Authors in an equal Number of  
Lines: Thus, that Pause is to be found,

In 514 Lines of *Ovid* 58 times.

In 514 Lines of *Virgil* 54 times.

The Difference on *Ovid's* Part is 4.

So little have you to boast of the greater Variety of the  
Pause (which in your *Supplem.* p. 17. you call *the Soul of*  
*heroick Poetry*) in *Virgil* than in *Ovid*.

'Tis true, in *Virgil's* first *Æneid*, compared with the  
aforesaid Book of *Ovid*, the Scale turns on *Virgil's* Side;  
for the above-mentioned *Cæsura* falls after Foot third in  
that *Æneid*,

1st

1st 100 Lines	} it occurs {	8 times.
2d 100 Lines		8 times.
3d 100 Lines		18 times.
4th 100 Lines		19 times.
5th 100 Lines		13 times.
6th 100 Lines		17 times.
7th 100 Lines		9 times.
Remaining 60 Lines		7 times.

In all 99 times.

Whereas in an equal Number of Lines in *Ovid's Metamorph.* that happens but 79 times. The Difference therefore on *Virgil's* Part is 20; which I take, in a Matter of that Kind, to be of very small Importance, and in the main purely casual. That it is so, may appear from this, that the *Gap* (if I may so call it) between one *uncommon* Pause and another varies very much. For sometimes in *Ovid* we will meet with 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and once 42 Lines paused after the *common* Way, before we come to the Pause that is *uncommon*. And in *Virgil's* 1st *Georgick* we will find 17, 19, 25, 28, and once 41 Lines betwixt them. And again, in *Ovid*, we will meet with *two* of the *uncommon* Pauses together, as 72, 73, and 130, 131, and 173, 174, and 241, 242, and 273, 274, and 504, 505, and 721, 722. And in *Virgil's* 1st *Georgick*, sometimes *two* of them together, as 370, 371, and 482, 483, and 485, 486. And sometimes *three*, as 18, 19, 20. And in his 1st *Aeneid* sometimes *two*, as 13, 14, and 267, 268, and 283, 284, and 402, 403, and 419, 420, and 434, 435, and 519, 520, and 612, 613. Sometimes *three*, as 503, 504, 505; and once no less than *six*, as 319, 320, 321, 322, 323 and 324. From all which it is manifest, that the Authors had no Plot or Design in the Matter, but that all was the Effect of pure Chance, as to that Particular.

Thus much of those two most considerable *Pauses*, of which you have said very little. As to your other lesser *Pauses*, about which you make so great a Bustle, they are to me, as you have represented them, altogether incomprehensible,



prehensible, and therefore shall insist no longer on them. But here, before I leave this Point, I must be allowed to observe, that all you have said on the *varying* of the *Pause* relates only to those of the first *Hemistich*; whereas there is an equal, if not a greater Difference between these lesser ones of the second *Hemistich*, of which you have not taken the least Notice. Of these I shall only mention three.

*First*, That, tho' it is generally reckoned a Beauty in *Heroicks*, that the Feet of the first *Hemistich* do not coincide with the Words, and that the Verse runs harsh, where the one does not break or divide the other: Yet it is quite otherwise in the second *Hemistich*, none of which run more smoothly and harmoniously, than such as have the *two* or *three* last Feet composed of whole Words. I shall give a few Examples from innumerable ones in *Virgil*, *Ovid* and *Buchanan*.

1. In the two last Feet.

VIRGIL.

*Tityre, in patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi:*  
*O Meliboe, Deus nobis haec otia fecit.*  
*Sed tamen ille Deus qui sit, da, Tityre, nobis.*

OVID.

*In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas:*  
*Ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen.*  
*Ante mare, & tellus, & quod tegit omnia caelum.*

BUCHANAN.

*Arbor erit, quem non violento Sirius aestu*  
*Exurit, non torret hyems, sed prodiga lato.*  
*Pulveris instar erunt, volucris quem concita gyra:*

2. In the three last Feet.

VIRGIL.

*Nos patriae fines, & dulcia linquimus arva:*  
*Fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota.*  
*Castaneae molles, & pressi copia lactis.*

OVID.

## OVID.

*Iussit, & erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.  
Non tuba directi, non aris cornua flexi.  
Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant.*

## BUCHANAN.

*Sic formidandæ grave spiritus infremit ira.  
Munificus dedit; &, qui conspicit omnia, justus.  
Inque bonus bonus es; male cantas cautior artes.*

The *Second* is what *Erythræus*, after *Diomedes*, calls the *Tetrapodia bucolica*, that is, when the *Hepthemimeres*, or *Cæsura* after the third Foot, has two short Syllables following it to make a *Dactyle*; as,

*Nonne fuit satius tristes Amaryllidos iras.*

This *Tetrapodia* also takes place, when there is no *Cæsura*; as,

*Aut metuet dulces, aut experietur amarus:*

and is most beautiful, when that fourth Foot ends the Word; as,

*Parta meæ Veneri sunt munera: namque notavi.*

It is call'd *bucolica*; because constantly used by *Theocritus* in his *Bucolicks* or *Pastorals*: Tho' *Virgil*, in his, has not been so scrupulous, which has made some think that his *Pastorals* are less *harmonious*, and in that Respect inferior to those of *Theocritus* \*.

The *Third* is what your *Erythræus* calls the *Hendechemimeres*, which is, when after the fifth Foot there remains a Syllable finishing the Word, and can never happen but when the last Word in the Verse is a *Monosyllable*; as in that of *Virgil*,

*Sternitur, exanimisque tremens procumbit humi bos.*

'Tis true *Servius*, and (whose Authority is of much greater

\* The very learned and judicious *Monf. Rapin*, in his *Dissertation, de carmine pastorali*, p. 86. says, *De numero hujus carminis sic statuo: de eo non tam sollicitè superstitiosèque laborandum atque existimat Terentianus; qui dactylum in quarto pede semper collocari debere vult, saltem ut plurimum. Quod quidem factum videmus à Theocrito, sed à Virgilio neglectum; vel quia res non ita ferebat, vel, ut existimat Diomedes, quod vitios sit observationis hujus difficultate, &c.*

greater Weight) *Quintilian*, condemn such Verses as end with a Monosyllable, unless it be the Name of some small Animal, as in that of *Horace*,

*Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*

But *Erythraeus* has shew'd that there is no Ground for such a Pretence, by producing from *Virgil* upwards of 300 Verses terminating in Monosyllables, which 'tis not to be thought that great Author would have so frequently practis'd, had it been a real Blemish in Poetry. And so far was *Horace* from thinking it a Fault, that he seems, on the contrary, to have affected to end his Verse with such short Words, both in his *Satyrs* and in his *Epistles*. It must however be own'd, that the Poets who came after, both ancient and modern, have been very sparing in concluding their *Hexameter* or *Pentameter* Lines with Monosyllables, unless where the last Syllable of the preceeding Word was exploded by *Elision*; as in *Buchanan*, *Pf. i.*

*Ille velut riguae quae confita margine ripae est.*

And in *Johnston*, *eod. Pf.*

*Diraque cum domino fraus peritura suo est.*

I thought proper to say thus much of these smaller *Pauses*, and the Variations of them, in the second *Hemistich*; because, tho' you have entirely overlook'd them, they are fully as considerable as those you lay so much Stress upon in the first *Hemistich*. As to the Syllable after the second or third Foot, which divides the two *Hemistichs*, and is the most remarkable of all the *Pauses*, as I have in general explain'd them already, so I will have occasion afterwards more particularly to shew, whether of our two Poets has most frequently and most agreeably varied the placing of them.

II. I go next to that *Excellency* of *Virgil's Versification*, which you call *the Inversion of the Phrase*: By which (so far as I can understand you) no more is meant than the transposing of the Words out of the natural into the artificial Order; and is equally common to Prose as well as Verse, tho' the latter is in this indulged some greater Liberty than the former. This is that which gives a peculiar Musicalness and Harmony to the *Greek* and *Latin*  
Lan-



Languages above all others, especially our modern ones, which being destitute of that great Variety of Terminations in the Inflections of their declinable Parts of Speech, that these Tongues abound with; are for that very Reason incapable of having any considerable Change made in the Order of the Words in Sentences, and of consequence of that grateful Sensation thence arising to the Ear, without embarrassing and sometimes quite destroying the Sense. This is particularly taken Notice of by the learned Father *Lamy*, in his most ingenious Treatise of *Rhetoric*, as the singular Excellency of these two Languages above all others in the World: And as an Instance of it, he brings this short *Latin* Sentence, *Deus creavit mundum*; which can be changed six different Ways, without marring or altering the Sense; but if translated into any of our modern Languages, will hardly bear the Order of the Words to be twice changed †. But what is that to the Purpose here? Or wherein does this *Inversion* of the *Phrase*, or artificial Position of the Words in *Virgil*, differ from that in other Poets, and I may add in the main, from that in all other *Latin* Writers whatsoever? It was trifling in you to produce Examples, either from *Virgil* or *Johnston*, for what you call the *Inversion of the Phrase*, when you cannot find a Page, nay but seldom a Sentence, in any tolerable Author, where it does not more or less take place. The Instances you give are, where the Verb is put at, or near the End of the Sentence: Which is a Rule of *Elegance* commonly taught Boys at School, and is taken particular Notice of by *Quintilian*, lib. ix. cap. 4. *Verbo* (says he) *sensum claudere, multò, si compositio patiatur, optimum est*. But he most judiciously adds this Caution, *At si id asperum erit, cedat hæc ratio numeris, ut fit apud Græcos Latinosque Oratores* (and much more might he have said, *Poetas*) *frequentissimè*. And then he concludes with this general Prescription, *Felissimus sermo est, cui & rectus ordo, & apta junctura, &*

G

cum

† The learned *Is. Vossius*, in his ingenious Treatise, *de Poematum cantibus & viribus Rhythmi*, has some pretty Observations on this Head, p. 40. & seqq.

*cum his numerus opportunè cadens continget.* A Rule common to all good Writers, and by none more exactly observed than by our *Buchanan*, who furnishes us with more Examples in his very first Psalm, where the Sense and the Verb end together, or very nearly, than what you have brought from different Places of *Virgil* and *Johnston*.

III. But I pass this, which indeed ought not to have been mentioned at all, and come to your third *Head*, which I own to be of considerable Importance in true Poetry, viz. *The adapting the Sound to the Sense*. And in this it is confess'd, that *Virgil* has been happy to Admiration, and beyond all others that ever wrote either in Verse or Prose; for the thing is common to both. But here there are two Things fit to be observed :

*First*, That a great deal of this is founded in the Words themselves. For tho' I will not go so far, as to think with *Plato* and some of the *Pythagorean* Philosophers, that all Words are naturally expressive of the Things signified by them; yet 'tis certain that in all Languages there are a great Number of Words, which in their very Sound have a natural Congruity to the Things they represent, such especialy as signify or relate to quick Motions, strong or violent Actions, loud and noisy Sounds; vehement and unusual Passions, as of Grief, Fear, Anger, and the like: Of which I might produce, if there were Occasion for it, innumerable Examples.

*Secondly*, It is natural, besides what may answer that Purpose in particular Words, for Persons even in ordinary Discourse, to range them in Sentences in such a Manner, or to give them a quicker or slower Pronunciation, so as to make them bear a nearer Resemblance to their inward Sentiments than they would otherwise do. Much a-kin to these are the various *Gestures* of the Body and the *Tones* of the Voice, which *Demosthenes* and *Cicero* call *Action*, and attribute so much to; and which no doubt are highly subservient to the same Design.

But to come more particularly to the Point in hand, tho' I cannot pretend that *Buchanan* has been so lucky in making his Words an *Eccho* (as Mr. *Pope* represents it)

to

to his *Sense*, as *Virgil*, (for who can be compared with that matchless Author?) yet I am very confident that there are hardly any others, (far less *Dr. Johnston*) who have surpass him in that Art. The learned Editors of the last Impression of his Paraphrase have given us some Instances of this Kind in his 18th Psalm; to which, tho' I might add a vast Number more, I shall content myself with these few.

*Pf.* lxxviii. 47, 48.

*Grandinis imbre hortos, lapidosâ grandine vites,  
Grandine silvarum Dominus decussit honorem,  
Grandine prostrati fortes jacuere juvenci.*

where the rattling Noise of the Hail, and the terrible Havock that it made, is as it were represented to our Senses: Not to mention the beautiful and affecting Repetition of the Word *grandinis* and *grandine*.

So a little before *Ver.* 28.

*Castra super, tensisque super tentoria velis,  
Alituum tremulis resonabant agmina pennis;*

where one would be apt to think that he heard the *fluttering Noise*, which these Quails made in their falling down in the *Israelitish Camp*.

Thus in *Pf.* civ. 9.

*Neve iterum immissa tellus stagnaret ab unda;  
Limitibus compressa suis resonantia plangit  
Littora——*

where, in the Words *resonantia plangit*, we seem, as it were, to hear the *roaring* of the Waves, as they dash themselves against the Shore.

And *ibid.* *Ver.* 25.

*—— tot millia gentis  
Squamigera tremulâ per stagna liquentia caudâ  
Exsultant——*

where we have, as it were, represented before our Eyes, how the Fishes skip and dance hither and thither in numberless Crowds through the Sea.

And once more in the *Ver.* following,

*—— tot monstra ingentia & horrida visu  
Veliferas circum nant puppes——*

where the *monstra ingentia* and *horrida* do sensibly express the



the *frightful* and *hideous* Appearance these Sea Monsters give to the Beholders. And the three continued *Spondees* after one *Dactyle* in *Veliferas circum nant puppes*, do in a lively Manner represent the Difficulty that these Animals have (because of their vast Bulk) to make their Way about the Ships.

IV. Your *Fourth Beauty* is the *mixing the singular and plural Numbers*; of which you bring some Examples, first from *Virgil*, and then from *Johnston*. But of these I make the same Account, as of your second Article concerning the *varying of the Pause*, which in the main is purely casual, and has nothing else to recommend it, but the *Variety*. It would be a very idle Labour to search for Examples of them in *Buchanan*, when there is not a *Psalm* that does not furnish us with some of them. You indeed tell us, that every Couplet in *Johnston's* 1st Psalm affords an Instance of that Kind: But why, in reckoning them up, do you pass over the 2d and 5th? And (which is more) why do you, without any Authority, change the *consilio iniquo* in the first Couplet, (which is the Reading of all the Copies except your own) into *consiliis iniquis*. But what does all this amount to, but that accidentally you have in one Line a *singular*, and in another a *plural*, or *vice versa*; as,

*Fussa parentis, — axe dies.*

*Felicibus auris, — ripam aquæ, &c.*

And is there any Author, where innumerable like Examples are not to be found? Thus in *Buchanan's* Psalm cxvii. which is the shortest of all, we have,

*Omnes gentium — solis orbita.*

*Rerum parentis — Laudes pangite.*

*indulgentiam — nos in dies.*

*Foventis — constantiam — Promissa reddere.*

Thus in *Ps. civ.*

*Deus alme — Parentem rerum.*

*Ætheris Rector — æternas habenas.*

*decor — gloria — auratis pennis.*

*velo — tentoria — nitidi cæli.*

*liquidas lymphas — curvo fornice, &c.*

But it is mere trifling to go any farther. As for these  
which

which you think more material, take to match them these following from the same *Psalm*, almost close together.

*Tu, pater, aërios montes, camposque jacentes, &c.* where we have *pater* and *montes*; *nectare* and *semina*; *luminis* and *oras*; *pecus* and *pabula* and *foeni*; *olus* and *humanos usus*; *pocula* and *vini*; *vultus* and *succus, &c.*

V. Your *Fifth Head* is, *the artful Use of the Particles que and et.* As to which, it is something pleasant to observe, that you, the *Buchananomastiges*, are at Variance with one another. For what you commend as a great Beauty (as it generally is in Poems of a lofty Strain) in *Virgil* and *Johnston*, is by Dr. *Eglesham* condemned as a great Fault in *Buchanan*. For the 4th Objection he makes in his *Poeticum duellum* against *Buchanan's* Version of the 104th *Psalm*, is the nauseous (as he reckons it) Repetition of the Conjunctions, *et, atque, que, ac.* Of which he numbers up no fewer than thirty four in this *Psalm*. I could bring a great many other Examples, in which that Author makes a very frequent Use of these connecting Particles. But till you and Dr. *Eglesham* come to some Agreement about them, I pass them over, and go to the

VI. *Sixth Article, viz. the Collocatio verborum.* And of this you tell us, p. 51. that Examples in *Virgil* are frequent, tho' here, p. 39. you give us only one. If no more is meant by your *Collocatio verborum*, than what belongs to your 2d *Article, viz.* what you call *the Inversion of the Phrase*, of which we have taken sufficient Notice above, I own, that not only in *Virgil*, but in all other Authors, Examples are not only frequent but innumerable, the Thing being essential to and inseparable from the *Genius* of the *Latin* Tongue. But if by the *Collocation of Words*, you do (as the Instance you bring from that Author seems to insinuate) understand that particular Disposition, not of *Words*, but of *one Word* only, mentioned and much admired by the great *Scaliger*, then Examples of it are very far from being frequent, even in *Virgil* himself. That I may be the better understood, take the Description that noble Critick gives of it in his own Words, *Poet. lib. iv. cap. 48. p. m. 530. Mirum*

(says he) *quantum afferat vel affectus vel ornamenti vox, quæ in principio carminis ponitur post expletam sententiam; quæ vox tamen illi apposita apponit & sensum.* And then he brings these Examples:

First of *crudelis*, *Æn.* ix. 482.

————— *Tunc ille jenuctæ*  
*Sera mea requies potuisti linguere solam,*  
*Crudelis* ——— And *Æn.* iv. 310.  
*Et mediis properas Aquilonibus ire per altum,*  
*Crudelis* ———

Then of *infelix*, *Æn.* ii. 344.

*Et gener auxilium Priamo Phrygibusque ferebat,*  
*Infelix* ———

And lastly of *venatrix* and *bellatrix*, *Æn.* i. 322.

————— *dederatque comam diffundere ventis*  
*Venatrix* ——— And *Ver.* 496.  
*Aurea subnectens exerta cingula mammæ*  
*Bellatrix* ———

And of this Kind is the Example you bring from the same Author, *Geo.* i. 477.

*Vox quoque per lucos vulgò exaudita silentes,*  
*Ingens* ———

As is likewise that of *Buchanan*, *Pf.* lxxxix. 30.

*Quod si posteritas mea fœdera sancta profanet*  
*Immemor,* ———

But when you apply this (which *Scaliger* says, if it may be called a Figure, he would name it *Expressio*) to *Dr. Johnston*, the Instance you offer, *Pf.* lxxii. 7.

*Candida tum probitas florebit, & optima rerum*  
*Pax, vario donec lumine Luna nitet,*

has not the least Affinity to it. For *optima rerum* makes no Sense without *Pax*: whereas in the Examples brought by you and *Scaliger* from *Virgil*, the Sentence is complete, without the Addition of *crudelis*, *infelix*, *ingens*, &c. And it is to that Circumstance alone that *Scaliger* attributes the wonderful Beauty that strikes the Mind in these Passages. I shall not mention, that what you commend so much in *Johnston* is taken from *Claudian*,

————— *Pax optima rerum*  
*Quas homini novisse datum* ———

with



with the Alteration of *Pax* being carried from the Beginning to the End of the Clause. But it passes my Comprehension to account for what you further add here, p. 51. viz. "That considering this Word *Pax* is a *Monosyllable*, you believe it will be difficult to match it in " *Latin Verse*, either *Heroick* or *Elegiack*." And, "That the Reader cannot but perceive how great an Effect it " has in this Place." That it will be difficult to match it either in *Heroicks* or *Elegiacks*, (and you might have said the same of any other kind of Verse) I can easily grant you. But what then? May not a certain kind of Deformity be unusual as well as of Beauty? tho' I will not say, that is the Case here. But what Beauty there is in the above Couplet, arising from the first Word of the *Pentameter* its being a *Monosyllable*, and completing the Sense, I cannot possibly perceive, more than if it should begin with a Word of two or more Syllables, as in those of *Ovid*, *Pont.* ii. 3. 19.

*Illud amicitiae quondam venerabile numen  
Prostat; & in quaestu pro meretrice sedet.*

And *Ver.* 77.

*Primus ut auderem committere carmina famae  
Impulit: ingenii dux fuit ille mei.*

And in innumerable Places of that and other Authors. How the *Monosyllables* should in the above Circumstances happen to be so rare, I know not. This I am pretty sure of, that had there been any great Excellency in it, these ancient Poets could not have fail'd to have observed it, and more frequently to have used it; whereas, I believe, it is not four times to be found in all *Virgil's Works*. Once I remember, *Aen.* ii. 778.

— *Nec te comitem asportare Creusam  
Fas: —*

I have met with but one Example that I can think of in all *Horace's Odes*, *Car.* iv. 11, 25.

*Terret ambustus Phaëthon avaras*

*Spes, —*

Twice in our *Buchanan*, *Pf.* lxxv. 5.

*Finium terræ Deus ultimorum*

*Spes, —* And *Pf.* cxiii. 8.

*Spe mens labores auxilii tui*

*Fert.* —

And so in Dr. Pitcairn's Version of *Pf. civ. 21.*

*Ille ferarum leo sævientum*

*Rex,* —

But that all this was the Effect of pure Chance, not only in them, but even in Dr. Johnston, may appear from this, that in all his Paraphrase, we have not, so far as I can discover, but this and one other Example, *Pf. xxiv. 4.*

*Cui manus est insons, cor purum, nescia fastus*

*Mens* —

which yet, after all, have nothing (as I said) similar to that which you bring out of *Virgil*, where (besides the main Circumstance mentioned above) the Word beginning the Line is a *Dissyllable*, as those noted by *Scaliger* are *Trissyllables*.

VII. VIII. I might pass over, as you do, your 7th and 8th Articles, which relate to the changing the common Pronunciation of Words; and to Lines contrary to the common Measure: Which, you say, your Author has judiciously omitted, as not being proper but in long Works, such as that of *Virgil's Æneid*. The Examples you give us of these two Articles from *Virgil* are, p. 39. of the former.

*Fluviorum Rex Eridannus* — And

*Stridere apes utero, & ruptis effervere costis.*

As to which, you'll allow me to observe, that neither of them are in the *Æneid*, but both in the *Georgicks*; one i. 481. the other iv. 556. The first, I own, is very unusual, and perhaps without a Parallel, either in *Virgil* or any other Author. Some will have the first Foot in *Fluviorum* to be an *Anapæstus*, instead of a *Dactyle*, the two first Syllables being short. Others (whom I incline rather to follow) will have it to be a *Spondee*, the two Syllables *vi* and *o* having coalesced into one, by the Figure called *Synecphonesis*, and the preceeding Syllable *Flu* made long upon that Account: Or (which seems very probable) that the Vowel *i* becomes the Consonant *j*od, *Fluvjorum*, as in *abjete*, *arjete*, *Nasidjeni*, for *ariete*, *abiete*, *Nasidieni*, &c. See my *Grammar*, Part iv. p. 142,

143. But which soever it is, I know not (as I said) another like it in any good *Latin* Poet.

The other Examples of *stridère* and *effervère*, with the penult *short*, is not so very rare, and may be used without Regard to the Length or Shortness of the Poem. You have an Example of the latter in your own *Johnston*, *Pf.* lviii. 9.

*Fervère subjectis quàm queat olla rubis.*

which I wonder you should not have mentioned here, especially as in your Note on the Place, you tell us that *Virgil* always uses *fervère* with the penult *short*, and I believe so do all other Poets, from the old Verb *fervo* of the third Conjugation; tho' (that *Infinitive* only excepted) *ferveo* of the second is generally made use of. Our *Buchanan* has taken the same Liberty in *fulgère* with the penult *short*, from the antiquated Verb *fulgo* of the third Conjugation, *Pf.* xlix. 16.

*Glarumve multâ fulgère gloriâ.* *Alcaick.*

And *Pf.* lxxxiv. 11.

*Tu das conspicuâ fulgère gloriâ.* *Afclep.*

in which he has imitated that of *Virgil*, *Æn.* vi. 826.

*Illæ autem paribus quas fulgère cernis in armis,*  
and in *Æn.* viii. 677. where we have also *fervère*,

*Fervère Leucaten: auroque effulgère fluctus.*

And had *Johnston* used these Words in like manner, I know none would have quarrell'd him,

The Examples you give of the latter of the two above mentioned Heads, are likewise from *Virgil*,

*Quod fieri ferro, liquidove potest electro. \**

*Saxa per & scopulos & depressas convalles:*

Where you say, the Lines are contrary to the common Measure, or rather are without any Measure at all. What you mean by saying, that these Lines are without any Measure at all, I cannot possibly understand; for if they had no Measure, I do not see how they could be Verse. All the Difference, that I know of, between them and other Lines, is, that they have a *Spondee* instead of a *Dactyle*  
in

---

\* Your *Erythraus* maintains, and bids fair to prove it, that the true Reading in *Virgil*, is *potestur*, and not *potest*.



in the fifth *Region*: Which is not only allowed in *Hexameter* Lines, but oftimes carries a singular Beauty along with it, when used upon proper Occasions. Of these *Versus σπονδαϊκοί* or *Spondaici* (as they are commonly call'd) your *Erythraeus*, in that Treatise of his which you extol so much, *de licentia & diligentia carminis Virgiliani*, p. 26. gives us a long List of no less than *thirty five*: And I have observed not much fewer in *Ovid*, not to mention other Poets of the first Rank, with whom they are pretty frequent. And that it may not be pretended, that they are improper in *Elegiacks*, the same *Ovid* (whose Authority, I hope, will be good in that Matter) furnishes us with many Examples to the contrary. See him in his *Heroides*, vi. 103. viii. 71. ix. 133. 141. xii. 121. and *Fast.* ii. 787. iii. 105. v. 7. 83. and 87. *Buchanan* therefore did nothing amiss in imitating these great Poets; once, I remember, in *Pf.* lxi. 26.

*Afflictos miserosque procaciter insultantes.*

where the following Line is a *senarian Iambick*; and once in an *Elegiack* Verse, *Pf.* cxxxvii. 7.

*Diripite, ex imis evertite fundamentis;*

and no doubt might have done it oftner, had he thought fit.

It is without Ground alledged by you, that such *Spondaick* Verses are only proper in such long Works as *Virgil's Æneid*. For though the first of the Instances you bring is out of that Work, yet the other is in *Geo.* iii. 276. But besides that, and some others in the *Georgicks*, we have three of them in that Author's *Pastorals*; one in *Ecl.* iv. 49.

*Cara Deūm soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum.*

Another, *Ecl.* v. 49.

*Pro molli viola, pro purpureo narcisso.*

And a third, *Ecl.* vii. 53.

*Stant & juniperi & castanea hirsuta.*

Which three Poems are all of small Length, the first consisting but of 63, the second of 90, and the third of 70 Lines. And there are several *Psalms*, even as paraphrased by *Johnston*, that are longer than some of these, such as the lxxviii. which has 80; the civ. which has 76; the cv. which has 90; the cvii. which has 84: And there are  
three

three that have more Lines than any of them, viz. the lxxviii. which has 146; the lxxxix. which has 102; and the cvi. which has 96 Lines. So that I am afraid that that Pretence is but an Excuse for Dr. Johnston's not having any such *Spondaick* Verses, and was the more idle in you, as that is by no means to be accounted a Fault in him.

IX. X. XI. I come now to your 9th, 10th and 11th Articles, on which you seem to lay the greatest Strefs, and I very little, in the *Art of Versification*, viz. what you after Pontanus and Erythraeus call the *Alliteratio*, the *Allusio verborum*, and the *Affonantia syllabarum*. As to which you tell us first in the general, p. 30. " That these " three Articles arise from Observations perfectly new " at the Time they were written by Erythraeus, about " 200 Years ago, and as new at this Time, having been " almost quite lost, by you know not what Accident, to " the World," till now it seems that you have again brought them to Light. By the by, you'll allow me to inform you, that Erythraeus is not the first Discoverer of these Excellencies you so much boast of in Virgil's Verse: Whatever is in that he owes to that great Italian Author and Poet, Jo. Jovianus Pontanus, who prosecutes these things at great Length, in his most ingenious Dialogue named *Actius*, whence Erythraeus acknowledges himself to have had them by the many References he makes to it. But, to put the Matter beyond Dispute, we have Pontanus's own Words to assure us of it, in the Basil Edition of his Works, tom. ii. p. 1347. *Verum* (says he) *ego longior fortè & ambitiosior explicandis his fui: feci hoc tamen eo libentius, quòd scriptum de his adhuc sciam à nemine.* Hieronymus Columna also, in the Life of Ennius, prefixt to the noble Collection he has published of the Fragments of that most ancient Latin Poet\*, with his most learned Commentary on them, has reckoned up a great many Examples of the *Alliterations* that are to be met with in him.

---

\* These are also taken notice of by the above-named Bernardinus Parthenius Spilimbergius, in his noble Treatise de poetica imitatione, fol. 120. *Multa huiusmodi* (says he) *apud Pontanum animadversa licet reperire, quem diligentissimum in Virgilianis numeris observandis fuisse, illius Actius testis est.*

him. But, as it is not very material who was the first that made these *Observations*; so I do not see, how they can be said to be lost, since there are several Editions of the Works, in which they are taken notice of, yet extant, and in the Hands of the Learned.

However, as to the Matter in general, though I will not deny, that these *Alliterations*, &c. do often give some additional Beauty and Lustre to *Virgil's* Verse; yet *that* is of the lowest Kind, and is infinitely surpass'd by others of greater Moment and Value in that incomparable Poet. There are two things that incline me to be of this Opinion.

The *first* is that mentioned by yourself, *viz.* that the Observation of them is but of a late Date, no sooner than about the Beginning of the 16th Century. Now, had there been so much of Worth in them as you represent, it would not readily have been overlook'd by those that have writ upon Poetry in general, and more particularly of that of *Virgil*, before that Time. And, I may add, that for the same Reason, it would not have been so much neglected (as you say it has) by those that have treated on that Subject since.

The *second* thing is, that there are a great many of the most shining Passages in *Virgil*, which have none of these Ornaments in them; which plainly shews, that they are comparatively of low Consideration, and noways essential to fine Poetry.

I might add, *thirdly*, That these things were not quite unobserved by the Ancients; only they had not that Opinion that you have of them. They allowed them *aliquid nonnunquam gratiæ & delectationis habere in argumentis levibus, præsertim si raro frequentarentur, locoque inferebantur opportuno*, as *Is. Vossius*, in his Treatise above mentioned, expresses it, p. 27. But how little Regard they had to them in grave and serious Subjects, will appear from the Words of the *Scriptor Rhetoricorum ad Herennium*, lib. iv. cited also by the same *Vossius*, *Hæc tria genera proxima exornationum*, says he, *quorum unum in similiter cadentibus, alterum in similiter desinentibus, tertium in adnominationibus positum est, perraro sumenda sunt*,



*Sunt, cum in veritate dicemus: propterea quod non hæc videntur reperiri posse sine elaboratione & consumptione operæ. Ejusmodi autem studia ad delectationem quàm ad veritatem videntur accommodatiora. Quare fides, & gravitas, & severitas oratoria minuitur his exornationibus frequenter collocatis; & non modò tollitur auctoritas dicendi, sed offenditur quoque in ejusmodi oratione auditor; propterea quod est in his lepos & festivitas, non dignitas & pulchritudo. Quare quæ sunt ampla & pulchra diu placere possunt: quæ lepida & concinna citò satietate afficiunt aurium sensum fastidiosissimum. Quo modo igitur, si crebrò his generibus utemur, puerili videbimur elocutione delectari: ita si rarò has interseremus exornationes, & in causa tota variè dispergemus, commodè luminibus distinctis illustrabimus orationem.* Thus that most judicious Author; and what he says of Oratory will hold equally true in Poetry.

But, to come more particularly to what you write of these three Articles by themselves, and, *First*, to what is called *Alliteratio*, which you distinguish into "*Initial*," "*single and double*; sometimes *treble*, or more frequent. " 'Tis likewise (you add) *mixt*, that is, both in the first Letters of the Words, and in the following Syllables. " It is sometimes so often repeated, that *Erythræus* terms it *Assultus*, or an Attack upon, or a Storming of the " Ear." By all which no more is meant, but a more or less frequent Repetition of the same Letter. Though more of this is to be found in *Virgil*, than in any other Poet whatsoever, and though it may sometimes add a small Ornament to the Verse; yet I persuade myself, that generally speaking, it was without any Design and owing to mere Chance. And this is no more than what *Pontanus* himself, the first Discoverer of these Beauties, does upon the Matter acknowledge, in *Actio*, p. m. 1357. *Nec verò* (says he) *is sum, qui negare ausim hujusmodi multa faciendis versibus sponte suâ ac penè fortuito occurrere, multò etiam plura ex habitu exercitationeque.* As to the thing itself, I will readily grant, that there are some Letters, which, whether frequently repeated or not, do more agreeably affect the Ear, and with their Sound make a more lively Impression upon the Mind than others.

This

This the famous *Scaliger* has given a very ingenious Account of, *Poet. lib. iv. cap. 47.* through all the Letters of the Alphabet, by shewing the particular Nature and Quality of each of them. This is also very elegantly set forth in that excellent Treatise of *Jo. Gul. Bergerus, De naturali pulchritudine orationis ad excelsam Longini disciplinam, illustri continentique C. Julii Caesaris exemplo, exacta, Lipsiæ 1720, 4to;* and is a thing much more material to have been taken notice of in *Virgil's* Versification; than the frequent *Chimings* of the same Letters, or even Syllables. The Ancients, who give the best Rules of Composition both in Prose and Verse, *Demetrius Phalerens, Dionysius Halicarnassens, Longinus, &c.* are very full upon that Head; but they (as you yourself own) not only undervalue, but sometimes condemn these other things which you so much admire. It is to this is chiefly owing that admirable Talent *Virgil* had of accommodating the Sound of his Words to the Sense, by his choosing Words made up of such Letters as were most fit for that purpose. The Repetition of, or playing upon the same Letters, may indeed serve to tickle the Fancy; but it is the peculiar Nature of them, considered either singly or conjoin'd with others, that makes them penetrate into the Soul.

Well: But let the Beauties arising from those *Alliterations* be as great as you please, it will upon Search be found, that *Buchanan* abounds as much at least with them as *Johnston*. Of the single initial *Alliteration* take this Example.

*Sancta Sionis templa quis incolet.* Pf. xv. *sa, si.*  
of the double, Pf. xviii.

*Scilicet immunem sceleris mentemque manumque. sci;*  
*see, me, ma.*

Of the mixt, Examples are innumerable, as Pf. xii.

*Surgam, ait, atque inopem tuta ut respiret in arce;*  
where we have a five times, and e as often. And Pf. i.

*Mente Dei leges noctesque diesque revolvit;*  
where we have the Letter e repeated ten times, s three times, besides the *assonantia* of the Syllables *te, De, le, que, que, re;* and *ges, tes.* And Pf. lxxviii.

*Templa sibi & solido fundata sacraria saxo;*

where

where we have a repeated seven times, *l* twice, *f* four times; with the *chiming* of the Syllables *pla, da, ta, sa, cra, sa,* and *fi, bi, li.* But it would be an Abuse offered to the Reader's Understanding, as well as Patience, to bring more Instances, when there is not a Page of any Poet, good or bad, that has not some of them. I shall only add some *Alliterations* from *Buchanan*, where three Words close together, or very near to other, begin with the same *Letter*, and sometimes *Syllable*.

- iv. Et sine sollicitudine somnos.
- xviii. —sancto sermone silentia rupit.
- xx. —memori tua munera mente.
- xli. Consilia cuncta conferunt.
- lvi. Nec liberas lucas laborum.
- lxviii. Sua seu sacraria visit.
- Ibid. Captivæque colla catenis.
- lxxviii. —ruit igneus imber in agros.
- Ibid. —trepido turbante tumultu.
- cvii. Arva jubet salsis subito sterilesce glebis.
- cxiv. Cur fugis in fontes fluminis unda tuos?
- cxv. Dis ipse similis fit suis.
- cxxv. Sinet piorum progeniem premi.
- cxix. Factio preffit malorum mille me molestiis.
- Ibid. Vota semper vana volvat.
- cxxxii. Lætitiæque piis perfundam pectora certâ.
- cxxxv. Pignora prima Phari qui fato extinxit acerbo.
- cxxxix. Nam nulla nostri tam minuta est corporis.
- cxliv. Surgit silva solo laurea—.

Here you have a good Number (larger, I suppose, than is to be found in Dr. *Johnston*) of these *Alliterations*: And as you are much taken with these things, you are in Justice obliged not only to praise *Buchanan*, but to prefer him to the Doctor in that Respect. But I must at the same time put you in mind, that there are several Authors of no small Note, that are very easy about them, and some that do not stick to reckon them rather Blemishes than Ornaments; as certainly they are when they appear to be affected. There are some in *Ennius*, that seem to be of that Sort, as,

O Tite, tute Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti. And,  
Brun-



*Brundisium polcro præcinctum præpete poriu:*

*Stultus est, qui cupida cupiens cupienter cupit.*

*Sed virum verâ virtute vivere animatum addeceat.*

Nay, there are who blame that Line in *Virgil*,

*Et sola in sicca secum spatietur arena,*

because of the hissing Letter *s* being too oft repeated: As

*Petrus Baudozianus*, in his *Latinae Poeseos thesaurus*, fol. 46. finds Fault with that of *Ovid*, *Met.* vi. 667.

*Corpora Cecropidum pennis pendere putares:*

*Pendebant pennis*——

because of the many *p*'s in it, who yet adds, that *quod aurium sensus tanquam ingratum respuit, id suo loco jucundum ac venustum est*, as in these of the same *Ovid*:

*Mense malas Maio nubere vulgus ait.*

*Dempta forent capiti quam mala multa meo.*

*Nam quanquam soli possunt prodesse potentes,*

*Non profunt, potius plurimum obesse solent.\**

I mention these Lines in *Ovid* the more readily, because, though you are otherwise at so much Pains to disparage that most ingenious Author, yet they are Instances of that kind of poetical Beauty, which you are extremely fond of, and ought therefore to be less severe upon him on that Account. I come next to what you call,

*Secondly, Allusio verborum*; by which, from the Examples you bring from *Virgil* and *Johnston*, you seem to understand the *Repetition* of the same Syllables †, as,

*Hoc metuens, molemque & montes insuper altos,*

*Te, Deus, implorans, implevi questibus auras.*

where, in the first Line, you have *mo* and *mo*, and in the second *im* and *im*. Of which Kind you have several Examples

\* Continuare duas aut plures voces ab eodem elemento incipientes, mos veterum fuit: sapè enim in Plauto atque Ennio deprehendas: etiam Ovidius non neglexit: Virgilius verò non sine ratione unquam posuit, *Arma amens capio: est enim anhelitus in iterata vocalis vastitate. Sic, Sale saxa sonabant, Sava sedens super arma.* Scalig. Poet. lib. iv. cap. 48.

† Others, especially Scaliger, Poet. lib. iv. cap. 33. by *Allusio verborum*, understand a quite different thing, viz. when Words agreeing much in Sound, are very remote from, and sometimes contrary to one another in their Signification; of which we have innumerable Examples in Plautus, and nor a few in other good Authors.

amples in *Buchanan* noted above; to which (if it were necessary) I could add many more, as,

xviii. *Sancta salutiferæ pandit compendia vitæ.*

cxiv. *Qui lapidum venas laticum laxavit in usum.*

lxxviii. *Per seriem, & seris venientia secula seclis.*

where in the first we have *sa, sa*; in the second *la, la, la*; and in the third, *se, se, se, se*.

Before I leave this, I must take notice of what you affirm, p. 53. of *Johnston's* altering two Lines in the 30th Psalm, from what he had made them in the first Edition Anno 1633, merely for the Sake (as you would have it) of this *Allusio verborum*; viz. ver. 1. it formerly run thus,

*Qui mea victrici cinxisti tempora lauru.*

but he afterwards changed it into,

*Qui mea victrici velâsti tempora lauru.*

And again he has changed,

*Spem mihi firmâsti rupis, Deus, instar abenæ,* into,

*Spem ————— muri, Deus, instar abeni.*

What was his Reason for substituting *velâsti* in place of *cinxisti*, I know not, unless that he thought the former sounded more softly †. Otherwise the Phrase is poetical enough, as appears from that of *Horace*, *Lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam*. But, besides, we have here no *Allusio verborum*, in whatever Sense you take it, as distinct from your *Alliteratio*; for *victrici* and *velâsti* agree only in the first Letter, the same Way as you cite *Virgil's Geo.* i. 1. for alliterating *segetes* and *fidere*, *vertere* and *vites*, *conveniat*, *cura* and *cultus*; and elsewhere *pulsa palus*. And in the second Line we have, as *Johnston* alter'd it, nothing but *Alliterations* of the *m* in *mihi*, *firmâsti*, and *muri*; and of the *i* in these and *instar* and *abeni*, as you have marked them. There was therefore no Occasion for your making *Allusio verborum* a distinct Head from either *Alliteratio* or *Assonantia syllabarum*. Your Master *Erythreus* uses it indifferently for both, calling it sometimes *Allusio literarum*, and sometimes (and more frequently) *Allusio syllabarum*, which he otherwise names,

H

Syl-

† Or perhaps he thought it better to imitate *Lucretius*, in that charming Line of his, *Vnde prius nulli velârunt tempora Musa*,

*Syllabarum Affonantia* and *Annominatio*: And when the same Syllable is repeated, he calls it *Complosio*. But however these things are to be nam'd, and whatever Value they may be of in Verse, I am sure it was not on that Account that *Johnston* changed the above-mentioned *rupis abena* into *muri abeni*. He had a much more weighty Reason for it, viz. that the Poets, and sometimes others, frequently speak of a *murus abenus* or *abeneus*, but never (that I know of) of a *rupes abena* or *abenea*.

The last of these Excellencies you observe in *Virgil's* Versification, and which *Johnston* has so happily imitated him in, is the *Affonantia syllabarum* or *Rhime*. And this you divide into the several following Sorts:

1. The plain direct Rhime, which is of two Kinds, single or double.
2. The intermediate or casual plain Rhime.
3. The scanning conclusive Rhime.

1. Of the single direct Rhime (which is nothing else but the Chiming of the two Hemistichs, so often mentioned above) Examples are so frequent in all good Authors, that it would be idle in me to produce any. *Buchanan* in particular so much abounds with them, that our *Dr. Eglesham*, and your *Mr. Welfted*, have had the Confidence to run him down on that account; not considering that he has *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Tibullus*, *Propertius*, (not to mention *Ovid* and others) to bear him Company. And he must have a large Share of Assurance, that will pretend to teach those great Masters the Art of Versifying. You, Sir, and very justly, are of a very different Sentiment, who highly approve these Rhimes, and tell us, p. 43. that *Virgil's* Poetry is almost all Rhime in one Kind or other; and, p. 53. that of the Kind we are now upon, the first Verse of *Johnston's* Paraphrase,

*Felix consiliis — qui non seductus iniquis,*  
and a thousand others, are Examples. And so say I of *Buchanan's* first Psalm,

*Impia sacrilega — flexit contagio turbae: And,*  
*Pestiferæ facilem — dedit irrisoribus aurem:*  
and innumerable others.



Of the plain direct double Rhime (which is that, you tell us, the Spectator speaks of, No. 60. and which the Monks were in Love with) you give us the following Instances in Virgil.

*Hic labor extremus, longarum*

*hæc meta viarum.*

*I nunc, & verbis*

*virtutem illude superbis.\**

*Cornua velatarum*

*obvertimus antennarum.*

But of these you bring us no Examples from *Johnston*, as I believe there are none; he having wisely shun'd these *carmina Leonina*, as they are called, which being but an Invention of later Times, is condemn'd by all good Authors. As for those few that are found of that kind in *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Propertius*, &c. it is agreed by all, that they were the Effect of mere Chance, and not of Design. And for that Reason, and as proceeding from the same Cause, may that of *Buchanan*, *Pf. lxxxix. 15.*

*Felices quos festarum*

*clangore tubarum,*

be forgiven him.

2. Of the intermediate or casual plain Rhime, you give this Example from *Virgil*,

*Imposuit, regemque dedit, qui fœdere certo;*  
and from *Johnston*, *Pf. xxx. 11.*

*Tu facis ut lacrimis, &c. with some others.\**

*Buchanan* furnishes us with Plenty of such, as,

i. *Sed vitæ rimatur iter——.*

xviii. *Me tegit, incolumemque rapit——.*

lxviii. *Accurrent, pacemque petent——.*

lxxxix. *Agmina nulla meam vertet sententia mentem.*

civ. *Tam variis fecunda bonis.*

cxxxvii. *Flevimus & gemitus luctantia verba repressit.*

cxxxviii. *Qui donis promissa novis cumulata rependis.*

H 2

3. Of

\* Most Writers, who mention this as a *Versus Leoninus* in *Virgil*, read it as you do, *I nunc & verbis, &c.* whereas in him, *En. ix. 634.* we have it, *Trajicit, I verbis, &c.* However the *Crambe* in both is the same,

3. Of the *scanning conclusive Rhyme*\*, you bring from *Virgil* these Instances,

*Silvestrem tenui musam medi--taris a--vena.*

*Nudus in ignota Pali--nure ja--cebis a--rena.*

But these you give us from *Johnston* are not quite similar to these, *viz.*

*Nec postica tuum sanna se | dile pre | mit.*

*Omnia propitio fidere | cæpta re | get.*

After which you add, " That this is one of the principal Arts, to which the wonderful Harmony of this Author's Numbers is owing. He had observed (*say you*) of what Use it was to *Virgil*, and he has introduc'd it every where into his *Pentameter* Verses. A Delicacy never thought of by any Writer of the *Augustan* Age."

I am at a Loss here to comprehend you. You own that it was of great Use to *Virgil*; and he certainly flourished in the *Augustan* Age, nay in the very middle of it. But it would seem that *Virgil*, though he made great Use of that *Art*, yet did not know the *Delicacy* of it. Pray, who told you so? Had *Virgil* that peculiar Beauty in his Verse, and yet was he himself not sensible of it? But you will say, that *Virgil* wrote very little in *Elegiacks*, and therefore had small or no Opportunity of knowing the Use of it in *Pentameters*. But as it is not (for ought I can see) more confin'd to one kind of Verse than another, what should hinder him from perceiving the Beauty of it in *Elegiacks*, though he did not choose that Sort of Verse? But might not *Propertius* and *Tibullus*, who liv'd and died in that Age; and *Ovid*, who did but a very little survive it (whose Verses are for the most Part of the *Elegiack* kind) have been sensible of that Delicacy? This is very certain, that all these make a very great Use of it; and if there is so much of Delicacy in it, as you represent, they must have been very dull, if they themselves knew nothing of it. 'Tis true, they do not speak of it in their

---

\* You tell us, p. 41. " That this Rhyme is so called, because it would hardly be perceived by the Generality of Readers, unless they first scann'd the Verse; but that when they have done that in three or four Lines, the Ear will afterwards make the necessary Distinction, without any farther Trouble."

their Works, and as little does Dr. *Johnston*; so that in this they are equal, and upon a Level. How comes it then that he should perceive it, and they not? Why? because he, it seems, makes more Use of it than they. Even that may be true, and yet they be as sensible of it as he, though for the Sake of more substantial Excellencies they make use of it less frequently than he does. Nay I will go farther by adding, that if he affected this Piece of Delicacy, and carried it beyond its true Bounds, he thereby became faulty. But all this is mere trifling, and I believe not the Case: For, upon Examination, it will be found, that there is more of Chance than Design in the Use that either he or they make of it. I have had the Curiosity, idle as it is, to make the Experiment in these three ancient *Elegiack* Poets of the *Augustan* Age, and in comparing them with *Johnston*, as to this Particular, I find that this *scanning conclusive Rhime* is to be met with,

In *Propertius*, I. i. — 2 times.

I. 6. — 6 times.

In *Tibullus*, I. i. — 9 times.

In *Ovid*, *Heroid* i. — 2 times.

*Heroid* 4. — 21 times.

*Trist.* I. i. — 10 times.

Again in *Johnston*, *Pf.* i. — 2 times.

ii. — 4 times.

iii. iv. v. xii. xv. not at all.

vi. viii. ix. x. xi. xiii. xiv. xvi. once each.

vii. — 5 times.

Long xviii. — 8 times.

So that the Odds, if there is any, is very inconsiderable. But as the Dispute runs chiefly between *Johnston* and *Buchanan*, I shall, for balancing Accounts betwixt them, set down particularly the Lines, wherein this your so much admired *Delicacy* takes place, by comparing them in these three *Psalms* composed in *Elegiacks* by *Buchanan*, with the same *Psalms* as done by *Johnston*. They are the lxxxviii. cxiv. and cxxxvii.



## BUCHANAN.

Pf. lxxxviii. —respue | mente pre | ces.  
 —languida | vita fa | ces.  
 —te retra | hente ma | num.  
 —lumina | victa ma | lis.  
 —quod sata | mergit a | quæ.

Pf. cxiv. none.

Pf. cxxxvii. —carmina | læta ma | lis.  
 —terra pro | sana mo | dos.  
 —experi | ere vi | ces.

## JOHNSTON.

Pf. lxxxviii. —despice | fronte pre | ces.  
 —sic sata | mergit a | quis.

Pf. cxiv. none.

Pf. cxxxvii. —tangere | dextra che | lyn.  
 —fidere | tacta me | is.  
 —pernici | osa di | es.  
 —in tua | tecta sa | ces.

By which it appears, that *Buchanan* exceeds *Johnston* by two: Not to mention, that in two Places *Johnston* seems to have borrowed the Words, and consequently that Beauty (if it is one) from *Buchanan*; the *Despice fronte preces*, and *Sic sata mergit aquis*, of the one, having a near Resemblance to, *Respue mente preces*, and, *Quod sata mergit aquæ*, of the other.

Before I have done with this Article, I must take notice of what you say, p. 54. of that *Hemistich* of *Johnston*, Pf. viii. 5.

—& illustri cinxit honore comas;

“that if *caput* were put instead of *comas*, the Harmony “would be destroyed.” I am of a very different Opinion; for I do not see but that *caput* might be harmonious enough, and that the Reason why *Johnston* made choice of *comas* instead of *caput*, was, not so much on the Account of that Word’s being unharmonious, as that he thought

thought the other a more poetical, and consequently a more proper Word. But if the Harmony of a Verse is to be lost or destroyed by such a Trifle, what shall become of innumerable Verses, not only in your Author, but *Virgil, Horace, Propertius*, and all other the greatest Poets, where no *scanning* or any other kind of *Rhime* are to be found. *Ovid* (whatever other Faults he may have) was never yet blam'd for Want of Harmony in his Numbers; and yet, according to your Doctrine, that Verse of his, *Pont. iii. 4. 102.*

*Ipsa potest solitum nosse corona caput.*

is quite destitute of it. But had he written, as certainly he might,

*Ipsa potest solitas nosse corona comas,*

all had been right, for then we should have had *co, ro, co*, chiming together: But putting *caput* instead of *comas*, with you, spoils all. But what an unreasonable (I had almost said whimsical) Nicety is this, to make Poets rack their Brains to find out Words that will chime with one another, and to be more anxious about that, than the Justness and Propriety of Thought and Expression, which ought to be their first and principal Care? I deny not, (as I have often said) that such Rhimes may give some accessory Ornament to the Verse; but then they are to be taken as they offer themselves, and not to be solicitously affected and hunted after. Otherwise I am afraid they will (which is the Custom with bad Poets) invert that which you, and very justly, *p. 45.* call one of the greatest Excellencies in all *Versification*, viz. *The adapting the Sound to the Sense*, into a contrary Rule, of *adapting the Sense to the Sound* \*.

H 4

I have

\* I might here observe, as an Instance of the Disagreement of great Authors among themselves concerning these external Ornaments of Verse, what is advanced by *Quintilian*, and more particularly by *Servius* on the one Part, and *Erythraeus* on the other. *Quintilian*, lib. ix. cap. 4. says, *Videndum ne syllaba verbi prioris ultima, sit prima sequentis*: And *Servius*, on that of *Virg. Geo. ii. 13.* — *glauca canentia fronde salicta*. *Sane Cacophaton est glauca canentia*; and on *En. ii. 27.* — *juvat ire & Dorica castra*, *Mala est*, (says he) *Compositio ab ea syllaba incipere, quâ superior finitus est sermo. Nam plerumque & Cacophaton facit, ut hoc loco. Erythraeus*

I have now gone through all the Articles you have given us of the *Excellencies* of *Virgil's* Verse, and have, I think, shewn, that in every of them *Buchanan* has nowise come short, but that generally he has surpast *Johnston* in the Imitation of them.

As to what you add toward the End of your Prefatory Discourse, p. 56. concerning *Virgil's* other Ornaments of Eloquence and Poetry, and especially his beautiful Figures, *Apostrophes*, *Interrogations*, *Suspensions*, *Metaphors*, &c. with all which *Johnston*, you say, in Imitation of him, *does abound throughout his whole Performance*: I can with equal Justice say the same of *Buchanan*; but as you do not here insist upon Particulars, so neither shall I. What the learned *Calmet*, as you cite him, observes, may be true, viz. "That the Reason why few have succeeded in the Translation of the Psalms, has been, because they did not take care to insert the numerous Figures in the Original." But I doubt much, as to what you add concerning the Doctor, and aver as a thing you are pretty certain of, viz. *that he has doubled the Number of these Figures in his Translation*. And if this however were true, he must have over-acted: For *Figures*, as well as other things, ought to be kept within due Bounds. But what kind of *Figures* are those of the Doctor? Why, such as are most usual in *Latin* Poetry: And such also, and, I believe, in as extensive a Manner, are the *Figures* with which *Buchanan* has adorned his Paraphrase. But most of the *Figures* in the *Original* are of a somewhat different Nature, and such as are agreeable, and almost peculiar to

---

on the other hand, who gives us more than 130 Examples of this *Composition* (as he calls it) of the same Syllables in *Virgil*, tells us that he is extremely astonished that these Authors should condemn such a Concourse of Syllables, *ut hanc malam compositionem dixerint, quâ toties non insuaviter Poeta lectoris blanditur auribus*. And a little before he calls it *genus quoddam compositionis Maroniana Musa auribus jucundissimum*. See him, *De lic. & dilig. carm. Virg. cap. 9*. I will not take upon me to mix any farther in this Controversy, than simply and with all Submission to say, that in my Opinion the Matter is carried beyond due Bounds on both Sides; and that as such *Compositions* in *Virgil* seem to be the Effect of Chance, and not Design, so they appear to me to have very little either of Beauty or Deformity in them on that Account.



to the *Language* it is writ in, that is, in the general, so *lofty* and *strong*, that it is hardly possible for any Translation to come up to them; and though it were, the different Genius of the two Languages would, in my Opinion, render it improper.

---

## C H A P. II.

I Am now come to the *Second* Part of my Undertaking, which was to consider the general Objections you make against *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, and to shew that there is little or no Weight in any of them.

### S E C T. I.

**BUT**, before I come to Particulars, I must beg Leave in the first place to undeceive you, as to some Misinformations you have got concerning that Author. And, I. You tell us, *Supplem. p. 2.* " That you have, *since the Publication of Mr. Lauder's Edition of Johnstons Psalms*, been informed, that the superstitious Veneration for this Part of *Buchanan's* Works, which has prevail'd so long, is not only abated, even in *North-Britain* itself, but that very different Sentiments have succeeded in its Place." What you mean by a *superstitious Veneration* I know not, (I wish the extreme Fondness you have taken up, first for *Milton*, and now for *Johnston*, may not deserve that Name.) But you must allow it to be a thing both just and laudable, that a Person who has excelled in any Art or Science, or has been singular for his Endowments either of Body or Mind, ought to be had in great Esteem by all, but more especially by that People or Nation among whom he was born. As this is true of our *Buchanan*, with respect to his poetical Performances, so the Regard we have for him on that Account is no more than paying him that Debt, which is due to the Memory of so great a Genius. But that this Esteem or Veneration for him, as you call it, is *abated*

*bated in his own Country, and that we now entertain very different Sentiments concerning him, is a pure Fiction of (whoever he is that was) your Informer. This is much of a Piece with another Story, (and I wish it may not be with your Participation) lately published in one of your News-papers\*, That Buchanan's Poems were at London so much despised, that Reams of them were sold for waste Paper. Strange! that he, who in the Judgment of the most learned Men of his and the following Age, was reckoned the greatest Poet that then had appeared, should at last fall so low in his Character, that his Works should not be thought worth preserving! But what is all this owing to? Why, to some few railing Pamphlets, which very few Persons of Taste were at Pains to peruse, and many fewer did approve of. And is it probable that these could produce such a wonderful Effect?*

After all, you yourself immediately add, p. 3. "That you do not in the least dispute, whether *Buchanan* is to be look'd on as a great Poet, and that this you readily acknowledge." But then you subjoin, "That what you differ from the Generality of Persons in, is, that you think that Part of his Poems, which is the most applauded, the least worthy of Applause." There is no helping or hindring of People's Thoughts; for in these they are for the most part guided by their Fancy, and often by Prejudice and Prepossession. You'll forgive me to say, that 'till you conceived that extreme Fondness you have for Dr. *Johnston*, you readily entertain'd the same Opinion concerning *Buchanan's* Poetry, and particularly his Paraphrase of the *Psalms*, that the learned World has hitherto had of them†. Had it not been for that,

---

\* It is called the DAILY GAZETTEER, Wednesday May 27. N<sup>o</sup>. 1742. wherein, by way of Letter to the Author of that Paper, we have this fine Paragraph. *SIR, The Publick is very much obliged to the Gentleman, (i. e. Mr. Auditor Benson) who has, at so great Expence, revived Dr. JOHNSTON's excellent Translation of the Psalms, and at the same Time so plainly shew'd how vastly it surpasses that of Buchanan, which is already become waste Paper, many hundred Copies of that Work having been sold for five Shillings a Ream by one of the most considerable Booksellers in London.*

† This appears from your Pref. Discourse, where, p. 28. you call *Buchanan's*

that, and that you could not endure that he should be rival'd, far less out-done by the other, this odious Comparison had not appeared. But whatever is in that, you'll excuse me to give you, not so much my Judgment, as that of Persons of the most refined Taste in those Matters, that *Buchanan's* Paraphrase is the most shining and illustrious of all his Performances.

And here I cannot but smile, when I observe that you and Mr. *Lauder*, with respect to this Controversy, are,  
 ——— in hac re scilicet una

*Multum dissimiles, ad cætera pene gemelli.*

For he, in the Piece he names, *Calumny display'd*, Part II. from p. 21. to 37. is at a great deal of Pains to prove, that the *Paraphrase* of the *Psalms* (which of all *Buchanan's* Works you think the least worthy of Applause) is that which in the highest Manner is applauded by that great Critick, as well as Poet, *Jul. Scaliger*, in that short Poem of his, which is entituled, *De G. Buchanani carminis venustate*, and begins thus:

*Heri legebam, nuper allatum mihi,  
 Sapidum, tenellum, molle carmen, aureum,  
 Intelligendum vel puellis omnibus,  
 Si splendor, atque puritas, decus, nitor,  
 Animum subire luculentum ullum queat, &c.*

I am however persuaded, notwithstanding all that Mr. *Lauder* has said upon the Head, that both he and *Tule*, whom in this he follows, are much mistaken, when they apply these Lines to *Buchanan's* Paraphrase. For, not to enter into the Janglings betwixt Mr. *Love* and him, whether *Scaliger*, (who died in the Year 1558) had seen *Buchanan's* Paraphrase before that Time, or whether that Paraphrase, consisting of so many *Psalms*, and these in so many different Kinds of Verse, can properly be called *carmen*: I say, not to enter into these Points of the Dispute,

---

*chanan's* Paraphrase AN EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE. But this was before the Dispute concerning the Superiority of these two Poets had commenced here, wherein you thought the Honour of your favourite Author was so deeply concerned. To the same Cause is owing the very different Sentiments your Friend Mr. *Lauder* discovers in his Contest with Mr. *Love*, from what he had when he wrote the Preface to his Edition of Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase.



pute, I am convinced, and so, I believe, will every unbiassed Person, that tho' the Paraphrase may be called *carmen aureum*, and the *splendor, puritas, decus* and *nitor*, be justly applicable to it, yet it is hardly to be imagined, that ever *Scaliger* would call a Collection of the most pious, grave, sublime and divine *Psalms* or Hymns that ever were writ, a *carmen sapidum, tenellum, molle*, and *intelligendum vel puellis omnibus*, (whether you take *puellis* to come from *puellus* or *puella*.) These are Epithets that can by no means agree with such sacred Poems. It is therefore infinitely more probable, that *Scaliger* is speaking of some particular Poem, and that perhaps an amorous one, a Copy whereof *Buchanan* had sent him. But though these Lines of *Scaliger* the Father have no Relation, as I persuade myself, to *Buchanan's* *Psalms*; yet how high an Opinion *Scaliger* the Son had of them, may (among other things) be known from this, that in an elegant *Epigram*, writ to one Mr. *Morison*, our Author's Nephew, he very much commends him for having published a new and much more correct Edition of that Paraphrase, than had hitherto appeared. What the Judgment of other learned Men concerning that Work is, may be seen by their Testimonies commonly prefixed to it. I shall only mention one, (because it is that of an Enemy) I mean the famous *Adam Blackwood*, Professor of Law in the University of *Poitiers*, and he no mean Poet himself, who in the Preface of a Book writ in Confutation of *Buchanan's* Dialogue, *De jure regni apud Scotos*, yet is so just to him, as to give his Poems, and particularly his Paraphrase of the *Psalms*, this *Elogium*. *Nam, vel me tacente, vivent mellitissima poemata, vivet omnium seculorum memoria Psalterium illud Musis & Apolline dignissimum.*

II. But there is another Mistake you have suffered yourself to be led into, and which you give as a Reason why you have so low an Opinion of *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, viz. *the disadvantageous Circumstances he was in when he wrote it.*

As to the Circumstances he was in when he set about that Work, I do not see such mighty Disadvantages he was

was then brought under, as you represent. He tells us indeed in his Life, that it was *eo maxime tempore*, that is, *mostly* [not *altogether*] at the Time, when he was put into the Inquisition for a Year and an half, and afterwards shut up for some Months in a *Monastery* in *Portugal*, that he translated several of the Psalms into *Latin Verse*. He was then, 'tis true, in a troublesome and melancholy Condition; but what was then so proper for a Person thus situated to meditate upon, as the Book of *Psalms*, a great Number whereof were exactly suited to the State he was then in? And what more natural to one of his Disposition to Poetry, than to solace himself by turning them into Verse? Add to this, that though he was now and then teaz'd by these *Inquisitors*, yet he was disengag'd from all other Business, especially for these Months that he was shut up in a *Monastery*. But, what makes the Matter much more easy, he does not say that he then translated them all, but only *complures*, i. e. several, or a good many of them; but left the far greater Part, as I take it, to be done afterwards. And what, in my Opinion, removes all Difficulty, he had (as you yourself own) 12 or 13 Years, after he had escaped from his Prison, in which *he had sufficient Time to alter, add, amend, or retranslate what he had formerly translated, as he pleas'd*.

Before I take Notice of the Reply you make to this, (which I am to do by and by) allow me to observe to you, that, this Consideration apart, many excellent Performances have been executed by Persons under as disadvantageous Circumstances, if not more so, as our *Buchanan* was, when he set about his Translation of the Psalms: Witness the last and best of all the Works of *Severinus Boetius*, his Book *de consolatione Philosophiæ*; the celebrated Sir *Walter Rawleigh's History of the World*; and, which comes nearer to the Point in hand, the incomparable Work, and by none more admired than by you, the *Paradise Lost* of the famous *Milton*. The Condition of the two former, when they composed the Writings above-mentioned, are very well known; and it hardly needs to be told, that this last had been, for some Years before his applying himself to that Undertaking, quite

quite depriv'd of Sight, one of the most miserable and melancholy Circumstances of human Life: Not to add, that he had the Mortification of knowing, that the Heir of the Family he most hated, and had done greatest Despite to, was restored to his hereditary Throne; that his great Patron *Cromwell*, as an execrable Traitor, was dragged out of his Grave, and expos'd to publick Infamy on a Gallows; and that most of the Judges of that *Mock High Court of Parliament*, who had sentenc'd their Sovereign to Death, had undergone the Punishment such a monstrous Crime deserv'd; and that that horrid Deed, which he had extoll'd to the Skies as most heroick and meritorious, and had defended with so much Keeness against *Salmasius*, *More* and others, was branded by the whole Nation with the utmost Testimony of Abhorrence and Detestation. Tho' all these Things could not fail to affect so high a spirited Man as *Milton*, in a very sensible Manner, yet that did not hinder him from finishing one of the noblest Poems that ever had appear'd in the World.

III. There is a *third* Thing wherein you have been imposed upon, and, tho' true, cannot possibly bear the Superstructure you raise upon it. And that is the Occasion of *Buchanan's* undertaking that Work. As to which, you bring a diverting Story, which you have from *Dr. Mackenzie* in his *Life of Buchanan*, in the Second Volume of his *History of Scots Writers*; namely, that *the Translating of the Psalms was a Penance imposed upon him in the Monastery*. That worthy Doctor was my very intimate Acquaintance, and one for whose Memory I have a great Regard. But it was the good Man's Weakness, that he was sometimes too credulous; of which, besides this, there are several other Instances in that Work; and of which I have also been Witness in general Conversation. One Thing I am well assured of, that whencesoever he had this Account, his Information was bad, and that it (as a great many other idle Tales concerning *Buchanan*) is a mere Fable. That it is so, we may be convinced by the following Reasons. 1<sup>st</sup>, That had it been true, *Buchanan* would not have fail'd to have told us so much himself;



self; the Thing being such, as he had no Reason to be ashamed of, but the contrary. 2dly, Where do we read of such a kind of Penance, laid upon any, especially as *Buchanan* was accused of what was then thought by his Inquisitors heretical Opinions? A Recantation or Renouncing of these, either in Verse or Prose, together with some corporal Severities, would much more readily have been enjoined him. 3dly, He acquaints us himself, that the Design of his being shut up with these Monks, was *ut exactius erudiretur*, i.e. that *he might be set right in his Principles*, and freed from the Errors (as they were thought) he had formerly maintain'd. 4thly, The Character he gives us of these Monks render it altogether incredible, that they should put him on such a Task. He says of them, that they were *homines nec inhumani, nec mali*; but then he adds, that they were *omnis religionis ignari*. And is it to be thought that Men, ignorant of all Religion, would impose upon *Buchanan*, by way of Penance, a Latin Paraphrase of the most religious Book in the World. And if they were ignorant of all Religion, we may well suppose them very much Strangers to all polite Learning. And if so, can we well suppose they would prescribe to a Man a Task, concerning the right Performance whereof, they were in no Condition of forming any tolerable Judgment? All these Things put together, utterly destroy the Credit of the Story, and shew it to be entirely fabulous.

But it is strange to see how Men will stretch their Wits to find out Arguments for what they would fain have believ'd. You'll forgive me, Sir, to say, that you discover something like this in the present Case: For you immediately add, "And indeed this is strongly implied by "*Buchanan*, when he says he *was confined in the Monastery for some Months* (without saying how many or how few) and that during that Time he translated a very great Part of the Psalms, which, if he had spoke plainly, would in all Probability have amounted to this, namely, that he was confined in the Monastery till he had translated the Psalms; and that being very desirous of getting out of Prison, he had perform'd the

" Task

“ Task set, in a few Months. This would not have  
 “ been for the Credit of his Work, and therefore he does  
 “ not speak so plain as his Historian *Mackenzie*.” Here  
 we have a fine Wire-drawn Conclusion; but I am at a  
 loss to find its Connexion with the Premises. Why? *Bu-*  
*chanan* was confin’d in a Monastery for some Months, and  
 then he translated several of his Psalms; *Therefore that Task*  
*was a Penance impos’d upon him by the Monks*. He was  
 desirous to get out of that Prison; *Therefore to get free of*  
*it, and knowing that he could not obtain his Liberty on other*  
*Terms, he made such Haste in his Work that he bungled it*.  
 He did it in a few Months; *Therefore it was not for the*  
*Credit of his Work, that the World should know the Cause*  
*of it*. He speaks not a Word of its being set him as a  
 Task, and that by way of Penance too; *And therefore*  
*Dr. Mackenzie’s Story must be true, which tells us all this*  
*plainly, notwithstanding Buchanan’s Care to conceal it*.  
 Here we have a curious Train of Reasoning, all found-  
 ed upon our Author’s own Words. But, to my Appre-  
 hension, if his Words are to be the Text, we ought to  
 draw quite contrary Inferences from them. For 1<sup>st</sup>, As  
 I said before, the Design of his being sent to a Monastery  
 was, *ut exactius erudiretur, i. e.* that he should renounce  
 his Errors, and be more perfectly instructed in the *Papish*  
 Faith. And sure it must have been an odd Piece of In-  
 struction, that, instead of his being taught the Doctrine of  
 Transubstantiation, Worshipping of Images, Purgatory,  
 &c. he should be put upon paraphrasing the Psalms.  
 2<sup>dly</sup>, He does not say that these Psalms (however many  
 were of them) were all translated at that Time, but only  
*hoc maxime tempore*, that is, (as I said above) chiefly or  
 mostly at that Time, and therefore some, even of these,  
 were done afterwards, if not before. 3<sup>dly</sup>, I do not take  
*complures* in so large a Sense as you do, for a very great  
 Part. The more proper Signification of the Word is *se-*  
*veral, a good many*; which hardly of 150 will reach to a-  
 bove 20 or 30; and may be said of a smaller Number.  
 For instance, suppose 150 Men were engaged in a Skir-  
 mish, and that 18 of them were killed, it would not, in  
 my Opinion, be a great Impropriety in the Language to  
 say

say of these 18 indefinitely, *complures cæsi*. I mention this, because it is not altogether improbable, that he composed no more of these *Psalms* but 18, while he was confin'd to the Monastery; which were these he afterwards put into the Hands of that illustrious Printer *Harry Stephens*, who published them, together with Paraphrases of the same *Psalms* done by other Hands; under this Title, *Davidis Psalmi aliquot Latino carmine expressi à quatuor illustribus Poëtis, quos quatuor regiones, Gallia, Italia, Germania, Scotia, genuerunt, inter se commissi ab Henrico Stephano; cujus etiam nonnulli Psalmi Græci, cum aliis Græcis itidem comparati, in calce libri habentur: Ex officina Henrici Stephani, 1556. in 4to.* The *Psalms* of *Buchanan*, which *Harry Stephens* has thus compared with those done by *Salmonius*, *Flaminius* and *Rapicitis*, the *French*, *Italian* and *German* Poets he speaks of, are the i. iii. iv. v. vi. vii. viii. ix. x. xi. xii. xiii. xiv. xv. cxiv. cxxvii. cxxxvii. and the civ. which last he extols above all, and therefore puts it at the End of the Book by itself. It is therefore, I say, not altogether unreasonable to think, that these were all that he translated while he was under the Care of those Monks; at least, if he translated any more; they were as yet but rude and imperfect Draughts, not proper to be made publick. But whatever is in all this, I ask, *ably*, Whether by that Penance laid upon him, he was obliged to translate the whole *Psalms*, or a part of them only? If you say the whole, then, as his Task was far from being completed in these few Months, he had no Title to get loose from his Confinement so soon. If a part only, then he did the rest (and that certainly the far greater part) afterwards; and having full Freedom, and (for ought appears) Leisure enough, it had been an unpardonable Fault in so great a Poet, to do them in a faultiness and bungling Manner. *Lastly*, Had he translated a considerable Number, or a very great Part of them, as you render the Word *complures*, in so short a Time, it would have been so far from being a Discredit to his Work, as you represent, that, on the contrary, it would have been much to his Credit, if he did it well; and a good Apology for it, had it been otherwise: the one and



the other being very usual Topicks with several good Writers.

I hope what I have said is more than sufficient to remove your Mistakes, and to convince you that the Pretences you urge why *Buchanan's* Paraphrase should fall very much short of his other poetical Works, have no manner of Foundation. But one would think that there was hardly an occasion of my being at that Pains, when you yourself do upon the Matter give up these Pretences, by acknowledging that after *Buchanan* left the Monastery in *Portugal*, he did put off the Publication of his Paraphrase, till, not 9 Years only (as *Horace* advises) but 12 or 13 Years after; in which he had, in all Conscience, sufficient Time (as you confess) to alter and amend whatever was amiss in the first Draught of those he had done in *Portugal*, and to finish the rest and greater part of them, which as then he had not meddled with at all. But here you have a *Salvo* against that *Objection*: For, p. 4. you say, " That this indeed he had in his Power; but (you immediately add) that he did not employ his Time in that Labour, will sufficiently appear from the most indisputable Evidence: (1.) From his most zealous Friend *Beza*: (2.) From himself.

1. As to the first, you tell us, " That *Buchanan* published his Psalms for the first Time in 1564, or thereabouts. [I am pretty sure that the whole of them were not made publick till the Year 1565.] *Beza* (you add) immediately compliments him in a Copy of Verses, as equal to *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Catullus*, &c. But after he had more fully considered his Performance for about seven Years, he writes to him to advise him to correct some of them. This Letter was writ in the Year 1572."

2. As to the second, viz. *Buchanan's* own Evidence, you tell us, " That seven Years after this, namely, in the Year 1579, (about two Years before *Buchanan* died \*)

" he

---

\* This Letter was writ three Years and an half before *Buchanan's* Death; for it bears Date 16th March 1579, and he died on the 28th of September 1582.

“ he tells his Friend *Rogersius*, [Why not Mr. or *Daniel Rogers?*] that as to his Psalms he had corrected *some Things*, and would have altered more, even whole *Psalms*, if old Age had not long since deprived him of the Talent of versifying.” And then you conclude with these Words, “ From all these Particulars plainly stated, it is sufficiently evident, *that the Translation of the Psalms was imposed on Buchanan as a Penance; that he dispatched the Toil as fast as possible; and that he never afterwards made any considerable Alteration in the Work.*”

This is one of the most wonderful Pieces of Argumentation I have ever met with. Whether it should be attributed to that strong Prejudice you have taken up against *Buchanan*, or to pure Inadvertency, I know not. But, out of Charity to you, I chuse rather to impute it to the latter. But whatever Cause it proceeds from, the smallest Reflection will soon convince you, that it is good for nothing. For, whether after the first Publication of these Psalms, *Anno 1565, Buchanan*, either of his own Accord, or at the Desire of *Beza*, or any other, made any Alterations in that Work or not, is not the Question; but whether from the Year 1551 or 1552, in which he had translated a good many of them, to the Year 1556, in which he allowed *Harry Stephen* to publish 18 of them, and the Year 1565, in which the whole of them were sent abroad into the World, that is, for the Space of 4 Years, with respect to those 18; and for the Space of 12 or 13 Years, with respect to the rest and far greater part, as you acknowledge, he might not, or did not alter and improve them in innumerable Places, for ought you or I can know, unless we could see all the written Copies that were in his own or his Friends Hands during that Period. That he had sufficient Time afforded him for so doing, cannot be disputed. His Credit and Reputation, especially in a Work that of all his Performances he most valued, did certainly require it, and as certainly prompt him to it. And his delaying its Publication so long, is a vast Presumption that a good part of that Time was thus employ'd. After he had thus (as I may say) put the last

Hand to it, there was the less need of after Emendations, and however few or many these were, that can in nowise hinder, but that (as *Horace* words it, *Membranis intus p. fitis*, &c.) he might have made a great Number before that Time.

As to the Proof you bring from *Beza*, I must further add, that you do not fairly represent him, when you insinuate, that that learned Poet, as well as Divine, after he had past the highest Commendations on *Buchanan's Performance*, came afterwards not to be so well pleas'd with it. *Beza* was not so fickle and changeable in his Opinions, as that comes to. His own Words, which you have not thought fit to give us, will shew the contrary: They are, *Ego Psalmorum tuorum lectione incredibiliter delector: qui etsi tales sunt, quales à te uno proficisci potuerunt, opto tamen ut eos, quod tibi minimè difficile fuerit, ex bonis etiam optimos reddas, vel, si mavis, optimis, quales jam sunt, meliores*. Are these the Expressions of one that had changed his Mind as to that Performance; far less of one that thought, as you do, that it was a *bad* one? As to his wishing or advising *Buchanan* to make some of his Psalms better, is that any more than may be wish'd for in the best of all human Composures, those of *Homer*, *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Cicero*, &c. not excepted; in some Passages of whose Works learned Men find some Blemishes, at least complain that they come short of that Perfection which they find in the rest. And this is that which *Buchanan* could not but be sensible to have been sometimes his own Case, as well as that of others.

You conclude this Point with telling us, *Supplem. p. 5.* "That few People have ever had any Reason to imagine that *Buchanan's Performance* came abroad under the disadvantageous Circumstances you have represented, and (if we will believe you) have now made out. But what I have said is more than enough to demonstrate, that these Notions of yours are all fictitious and chimerical.

But tho' we should grant all you have said, yet it will by no means follow what you after subjoin, "That every impartial Judge must own that it is a Matter of some Weight in this Question." For it is well known that  
Works



Works perform'd under the same, or the like disadvantageous Circumstances you speak of, particularly such as their Authors either had not Time, or wanted Inclination to correct, are yet the most excellent of their Kind, and held in the highest Estimation to this Day. Of these done by Persons in bad Circumstances, I instanced *Bleatius*, Sir *Walter Raleigh* and *Milton* before: And of the other Sort we have two illustrious Examples in *Ovid* and *Virgil*; the former of whom complains †, *that he had not Time to give the finishing Stroke to his Metamorphoses*; and the latter was so little pleas'd with his *Æneid*, that he order'd it to be committed to the Flames \*. And yet the Work of the one (however you would rob him of that Glory) always was, and will be esteem'd one of the noblest Pieces of Antiquity; and the other the great Standard of poetical Perfection, and the most exalted Pitch to which human Wit can arrive. I could furnish you with other Instances of that Kind, but these I have given are sufficient to shew of how small Weight even that Plea is for disparaging *Buchanan's* Work, tho' the Topick you make use of to prove it should (as it is far otherwise) hold true.

There is one Thing more, which, before I leave this Matter, I cannot omit taking notice of, viz. your marginal Note in the same p. 5. where you say, "What these some Things were, which *Buchanan* had told his Friend Mr. *Rogers* he had corrected in his Psalms, may be seen in Mr. *Ruddiman's* Edition in Folio, namely, single Words, or sometimes a Line; as, for Example, Ps. cxxxvi.

" *Stravit & incassum confisum viribus Ogum,*  
" which before stood thus,

" *Stravit Ogum magno confisum corpore frustra.*

" But as to altering so much as any entire Verse, you do not recollect one Instance." To which I answer, That he altered only single Words (which he has done

I 3

† Trist. l. 6. 291. *Ablatum mediis opus est incudibus illud,  
Defuit & scriptis ultima lima meis, &c.*

\* *Ergone supremis potuit vox improba verbis,  
Tam dirum mandare nefas, &c.*

in a vast Number of Places) shews that in his Judgment no more was necessary. But had you more carefully look'd into the Edition you mention, you would have found, that he has changed sometimes half, sometimes whole Lines, and sometimes a whole Passage, or many Lines together. For Proof of this, see *Psf.* i. 5. vii. 13. xlviii. 8. cv. 31. cx. 7. but more particularly, *Psf.* vii. 4. viii. 3. ix. 7. x. 4. lxxvii. 5. lxxviii. 21. cx. 3. cxxxii 6. and cxxiv. 11. But what are all these to the more numerous, as well as more considerable Alterations, we may suppose he had made from the Year 1551, in which, or perhaps before it, he first set about that Work, to the 1565, in which he communicated all of it (except the 18 *Psalms* printed in the Year 1556) to the World? He was too well acquainted with *Horace*, not to mind (when he had so much Time for it) the Precept he gives to the *Pisones*;

— vos o  
*Pompilius sanguis, carmen reprehendite, quod non  
 Multa dies & multa litura coercuit, atque  
 Praefectum decies non castigavit ad unguem.*

How great Concern he took to have it done well, appears, among other things, from his Epistle to *Peter Daniel*, 24th July 1566, wherein he tells him much the same, as he did to Mr. Rogers afterwards: *In Psalterio multa typographorum errata correxi, quaedam etiam mea non pauca mutavi*; and then adds, *Quamobrem velim cum Stephano agas, ne me inconsulto id operis iterum emittat.*

## S E C T. II.

**H**AVING dispatch'd these *Preliminaries*, I come now to consider the Particulars, in which, upon comparing these two Translations, you contend that the Preference ought to be given to Dr. *Johnston*. They are (as you reckon them, p. 5) these three.

1. The Propriety of the Version.
2. The Language of it.
3. The Versification, and other poetical Arts or Excellencies of each Translation.

I. As

I. As to the *Propriety of the Version* with regard to *Buchanan*, you say, p. 6. " You must observe that he almost every where inclines to one or other Extream. " He is either entirely wide from the Original, or else he " creeps after it almost Word for Word."

As to his *Excursions into the Fields of Fancy*, (as you express it) you give us two Instances, viz. the Beginnings of the 23d and the 53d *Psalms*.

Before I examine these more particularly, I must premise that there are two Kinds of *Paraphrases*, one more close and confin'd, the other more free and diffused. The former Dr. *Johnston* has made choice of, and *Buchanan* of the latter. It may bear a Dispute which of the two is preferable, especially in Verse. For my own part, tho' I will not quarrel the other, I incline rather to think, that that which *Buchanan* has pitch'd on, has the Advantage: 1<sup>st</sup>, In this, that the Translator has thereby a larger Scope given him of expressing the full Meaning of the Original. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That in the *Lyrick* kind of Verse, in which *Buchanan*, for the Reasons mentioned above, has thought fit to translate the greater part of the *Psalms*, a concise Translation was utterly impracticable. For most of these consisting of several *Cola* or *Strophæ*, as they are call'd, it was not possible to bring the *Stanza's* to a due Cadency and Period, without several *Circumlocutions*, and oft-times Additions of Words, Phrases, nay sometimes of whole Lines, that are not indeed expressly in the *Original*, but may well be supposed to be couched under and implied in the Sense of it. Nay, this is so true, that there is no kind of Verse, in which such *Circumlocutions*, *Additions*, *Repetitions*, and the like, must not sometimes take place. Of these we have several Instances (of which afterwards) which *Johnston* himself, for all his *Conciseness*, was not able to avoid. But 3<sup>dly</sup>, These *Excursions* (as you call them) *into the Fields of Fancy*, are extremely agreeable, and, I may say, natural to *Lyrick* Composures, above all others: As is to be seen in a good Number of *Horace's* Odes; not to mention the yet bolder Flights of the Prince of such Poets, *Pindar*. And certainly it can



be no Fault in *Buchanan* to imitate those great and standard Exemplars.

On the other hand, the Method taken by Dr. *Johnston* of confining himself to one kind of Verse, and endeavouring to keep close to the *Original*, has made his Paraphrase, attended with several Inconveniencies, of which I have given a large Account above, from p. 14. to 25.

To return then to the first of these above-mentioned *Psalms*, where is the *Extravagance* (as you call it) of beginning it with,

*Quid frustra rabidi me petitis canes?*

*Livor propositum cur premis improbum?*

Which Thought, as you cannot deny it, to be beautifully express'd, so tho' it is not in so many Words set down in the *Original*, yet it is introductory to it, and clearly and necessarily implied in it. This *Psalms* (as Dr. *Patrick* and other Commentators observe) was probably compos'd by King *David* after God had brought him out of that great Distress, of which he complain'd in the foregoing. In that *Psalms*, *Ver. 16.* he complains *that Dogs had compassed him about*, and in *Ver. 20.* he prays that God would deliver his Darling, i. e. Soul or Life, from the Power of the Dog. By which he understands one or more of his cruel and malicious Enemies, who like ravenous Dogs, pursuing a stray'd Sheep, sought to destroy him. What more natural then, to keep up the Comparison, than to commemorate God's Goodness, who, as a faithful Shepherd, protects his Sheep, so he had delivered him from those his merciless Persecutors, who had so much of a Dog-like Fierceness in their Natures. That *Buchanan* had this in View, appears very probable (among other things) from his using the Word *canes* rather than *lupi*; these last being much more frequently represented by other Poets as the greatest Enemies to the Sheep.

As to the other Verse,

*Livor propositum cur premis improbum?*

that is likewise implied in the Words, *I shall not want*, i. e. not only (as Dr. *Patrick* expounds the Words, *any thing that is necessary for my Sustenance*, but also for a Defence against those who would bereave me of my Happiness,

i. e.

i. e. from my malicious and cruel Enemies, who are call'd the *Congregatio malignantium*, as well as *Dogs*, in the same 16th Verse of the preceeding *Psalms*.

What you quarrel in the 53d *Psalms* can be yet more easily accounted for.

*Opinionum fœda mentem toxico,*

*Corpusque scelerum sordibus*

*Contaminata turba, vela dum cupit*

*Suo furori obtendere,*

*Ferri ac referri sortis arbitrio omnia*

*Humana comminiscitur;*

which is a plain Paraphrase of the Words, *The Fool hath said in his Heart, There is no God*. For the first two Lines and an half are a true Description of this *Fool*, or, (if you will) in the plural Number, this *Company* or *Crew* of *Fools*, viz. such as *have their Minds poisoned with vile and irreligious Principles, and their Bodies polluted with abominable Practices*. And the Remainder of these Lines are an Explanation of what is signified by, *hath said in his Heart, There is no God*: Which is in other Words, *think within themselves, either that there is no God, and of consequence, that all things are carried on by blind Chance; or, if there is a God, he takes no Notice of what they do*. I might add, to confirm this, that nothing is more common in Scripture Language, than to call *wicked and irreligious Men Fools*. There is therefore no occasion for your breaking out with this Exclamation, p. 7. "Would any Man living conceive this Piece of *Latin* was ever intended for a Translation of *The Fool hath said, &c.*" For pray, Sir, if you were to paraphrase these Words in the full Meaning of them, could you do it to better purpose? This I am sure of, that the Paraphrases of Dr. Hammond, Dr. Patrick and Dr. Wells do perfectly agree with it.

As to the other innumerable Instances of this Kind that you pretend are to be found in *Buchanan*; as you do not produce them, so neither am I concerned to meddle with them: Tho' I am perswaded that most, if not all of them, can be as easily accounted for, as these two you have mentioned.

The

The other Fault you find with *Buchanan*, that comes under this your first Head, is of a quite contrary Nature, namely, his following the Original too servilely, as you choose to express it. I find it is a very hard thing to please you: For what you commend as a great Excellency in Dr. *Johnston*, is, it seems, an unpardonable Fault in *Buchanan*. You represent it as one of the distinguishing Properties of the former, that he is so wonderfully concise in his Paraphrase; but if the latter does in some Instances keep close to the Text, it cannot be suffered, but must be branded with a reproachful Name of *creeping after it almost Word by Word*, as you call'd it before, and now a *servile following of it*. I cannot say that this is fair dealing; for, take away these odious Names, I see no Difference as to this Particular betwixt our two Poets. Let us try it in the Instance you give from *Buchanan*, Ps. ii.

*Deinde allocutus Dominus est me, Filius  
Tu meus es, genui te hodie, me posce, daboque  
Omnes ut heres gentium fines regas.*

What is more servile in this than in *Johnston's*

*Eloquar edictum, Tu filius es mihi, luce  
Hæc ego te genui; munera posce patrem?*

As to the being concise, *Johnston* is too much so; for he hath nothing to answer to the Words, *The Lord hath said unto me*; these Words, *Eloquar edictum*, being a Translation of, *I will declare the Decree*, and that as literal and servile as any thing in all *Buchanan*. But there is besides this Incongruity in it, that it makes these Words to be uttered by God the Father; whereas they belong to K. David, or rather, in a prophetic Sense, to Jesus Christ, of whom he was a Type. And that it may not be objected, that *Buchanan* has omitted the Words, *I will declare the Decree*. I answer that he, following the *Vulgate*, hath express'd it in the preceeding Verse, *Qui—latè fundet mea jussa per orbem*; in which he hath also followed the Sense given of it by *Varatius*, who applies it to the propagating of the Gospel through the World by the Apostles in Christ's Name: *Hic (says he) Christus sibi ipse unus vindicat, quicquid per eos egit*. But this is wandring too much from the Purpose. To return therefore, where, pray, lies the

Odds



Odds betwixt, *Filius tu meus es, genui te hodie*; and, *Tu filius es mihi, luce Hâc ego te genui*? unless that the Doctor has *mihi* for *meus*, and *hâc* luce for *hodie*, or *boc die*. That to catch at such things as these is mere trifling, you yourself seem sensible, who do not here, as you do upon almost all other Occasions, match *Johnston's* Words with *Buchanan's*, as knowing that, upon the Parallel, the Difference would appear just nothing; or the Advantage ly rather on *Buchanan's* Side.

The next Exception you take to *Buchanan's* Paraphrase is, *his very frequent Spinning out, or rather Repetition of the same Thought, to make out his Verse*. This Exception I have obviated already, by shewing that it was unavoidable: And I add, that, if it is not carried beyond due Bounds, it constitutes one of the greatest Beauties of Speech, whether *metrical* or *prosaick*. That it is unavoidable, I need no more than appeal to the Writings of all Poets, and I may add *Orators* too, wherein there is hardly a Page or Paragraph, that has not some such Lengthenings and Repetitions, which (strictly and philosophically speaking) are not necessary to make up the Sense. It was therefore justly said by *Corradus*, in his learned Treatise *de lingua Latina*, p. m. 24. *Auctores seu Latini seu Græci supervacua putant esse diligentia in iis morosum esse, quæ ne vitari quidem semper queant*. This is so true, that the great *Virgil* himself, though the most reserved of all the Poets in this Respect, has often been obliged to *lengthen*, or (as you word it) to *spin out* and *repeat* the same Thought, for the Sake of the Verse. Of this take the following Examples.

[Æn. i. 282. *His ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:  
Imperium sine fine dedi.*——

ii. 255. —*tacita per amica silentia Lunæ.*

234. *Diridimus muros, & mœnia pandimus urbis.*

iii. 662. *Postquam altos tetigit fluctus, & ad æquora venit.*

iv. 18. *Si non pertæsum thalami tædæque fuisset.*

vi. 68. *Errantesque Deos, agitataque numina Troje.*

255. —*primi sub lumina Solis & ortus.*

269. *Perque domos Ditis vacuas, & inania regna.*

623. *Hic*

623. *Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hymenæos.*

vii. 50. *Filius huic fato Divam, prolesque virilis  
Nulla fuit——.*

53. *Jam matura viro, jam plenis nubilis annis.*

85. *Hinc Italæ gentes, omnisque O Enotria tellus.*

555. *Talia connubia, & tales celebrent hymenæos.*

viii. 39. *——certa domus——certi penates.*

658. *Defensi tenebris & dono noctis opacæ.*

ix. 249. *——tales animos——tam certa——Pectora.*

459. *——prædâ spoliisque potiti.*

x. 501. *Nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futuræ.*

So likewise,

*Geo. iii. 201. ——tenebris & sole cadente.*

*Æn. i. 308. ——quietum animam——mentem benignam.*

342. *Punica regna——Tyrios——Agenoris urbem.*

566. *Solvite corde metum,——secludite curas.*

660. *——novas artes——nova consilia.*

661. *——faciem——ora.*

668. *——meæ vires——mea potentia.*

726. *——resides animos——desueta corda.*

*Æn. ii. 221. ——sanie——veneno.*

*Æn. iv. 316. ——connubia——hymenæos.*

*Æn. v. 85. ——septem gyros——septena volumina.*

But, to come more closely to the Point, and the two Instances you bring of this kind from Buehanan's cxxxvii. Psalm, the first whereof is in *Verse 2.*

*Muta super virides pendebant nablia ramos,*

*Et salices tacitas sustinuerè lyras:*

where, pray, lies the Difference betwixt that and *Johnston's*

*Desueta saliceta lyras, & muta ferebant*

*Nablia——?*

For the *desueta lyra* and the *muta nablia* are as much a Repetition of the same thing, as *muta nablia* and *tacita lyra*. If this is a Fault, both Poets are equally guilty of it, and a greater than both, the immortal *Virgil*, as we have seen in the Examples above, and more particularly in these following.

*Æn. ii. 426. ——justissimus——servantissimus equi.*

*Æn. iii.*

*Æn.* iii. 326. *Stirpis Achilleæ fastus*——*juvenem sū-*  
*perbum.*

iii. 304. *Accipite animis*——*advertite mentes.*

*Ecl.* viii. 45. *Nec nostri generis*——*nec sanguinis.*

*Æn.* i. 551. *Quem si fata virum servant*——*si vescitur*  
*aurā*

*Æthereā*——*neque adhuc crudelibus occubat*  
*umbris.*

where the same thing is thrice told. And so, *Æn.* ii. 772.

*Simulacrum infelix*,——*atque ipsius umbra Creusæ*

*Visa mihi ante oculos*,——& *notā major imago.*

which your *Erythræus* much commends: *Attendenda* (says he) *Poetæ copia.* Nam *simulacrum, umbra* & *imago idem sunt.* And you yourself (not adverting that it will vindicate *Buchanan* from what you here tax him with) in your Note upon these Words in *Johnston's* 2d Psalm, ver. 4. ——*ira furorque comes*, agree with *Erythræus.* *Hujusmodi* (say you) *repetitiones verborum ejusdem ferè sensûs magnam quandam vim habent in sacris his carminibus.* It was hardly necessary to add, *in sacris carminibus*; for it holds, I think, equally true in all Kinds of Verse, and, as I said, in *Prose* too, when fitly and judiciously applied. However, as you mention the *sacra carmina*, you should have considered (before you had condemn'd *Buchanan* on that Head) that of all Books in the World, the holy *Scriptures*, especially in the *poetical* and *prophetical* Parts of them, do most abound with such Repetitions. And what if that is one of the Figures, which (as you tell us, *Pref. Disc. p. 56.*) Father *Calmet* blames the Translators of the Psalms for not taking Care to insert in their Translations?

In the other Instance you bring on this Head, from the aforesaid Psalm of *Buchanan*,

*Comprecor antè meæ capiant me oblivia dextra,*

*Nec memor argutæ sit mea dextra lyre:*

You shoot quite wide of the Mark. For though, as you observe, we have *dextra* twice, and *oblivia* and *nec memor* signify the same thing; yet we have two different, and not one and the same Thought. For the *Psalmist* is brought in here, in a poetical Manner, wishing or praying



ing that two things might happen. 1<sup>st</sup>, That, sooner than he should play one of the Songs of *Zion*, he should forget that he had that *Right-hand*, that was wont to be so employed. And, 2<sup>dly</sup>, That, though that should occur to his Mind, yet he wishes that that *Right-hand* may have forgot or lost its Skill; or, in other Words, not answer his Purpose, though he should be prevail'd on thus to employ it. Here, beside the *Prosopopee* of the *Original*, we have a beautiful *Climax* (a Figure that at other times you are very fond of) which gives no small Lustre to it.

And this leads me to another Observation of yours, *Suppl. p. 9. 10.* That whatever Addition *Johnston* makes to the *Original*, *heightens the Thought*, of which you give us three Examples in this Psalm, against which I shall make no Objection at this Time. But poor *Buchanan* is so unlucky, that when he takes that Freedom, "he often makes a kind of *Anticlimax*; and, instead of rising, he falls vastly below what preceeded." The Instance you give is from *Psal. i. 3. and 4.*

—sed prodiga læto

*Proventu beat agricolam: nec flore caduco*

*Arridens, blandâ dominum spe lætatur inanem.*

Upon which you add, "After he had said, that the flourishing Tree blessed the Husbandman with its joyful Produce, how strange is it to add, *that it does not flatter him with a vain Appearance of falling Blossoms?* how much better would it have been to have kept closer to the *Original* with *Johnston*?" But, pray Sir, consider the Matter more coolly: For you have not adverted that the Stroke you aim at *Buchanan* does fall on the Divine *Original*, which he has strictly followed; and if he is guilty of what you call an *Anticlimax*, so is it: For there the Tree's bringing forth Fruit in its Season is mentioned, before it is said that his Leaf shall not wither. Nay *Johnston*, whom you are so much concerned for, has kept the same Order; for he has first,

*Cui tempestivis curvantur brachia pomis,*  
and then,

*Nullaque vernantes decutit aura comas.*

If there is any Difference, in this respect, between the

two Paraphraſts, or between them and the *Original*, he muſt have another kind of Organs than ordinary Men have, that can ſee it. But what if there is no *Anticlimax* in the Caſe? and that the Meaning is, "That as ſuch a Tree not only brought forth its Fruit in its proper Seaſon, but alſo kept up a green and flouriſhing Verdure through the whole Year: So God would proſper the pious Man, not only in his greater, but leſſer Concerns." This is the Interpretation that Dr. *Wells* gives of the Place. Or what if we ſhould render *Buchanan's* Words thus: "The godly Man ſhall be like a Tree planted in good and ſappy Ground, which does not fail to reward the Gardiner's Pains, as many other Trees do; which though they, with their early Leaves, and perhaps Bloſſoms, promiſed him a plentiful Crop, yet at laſt diſappoint him of his Expectation."

II. But the next Attack you make upon *Buchanan* is the moſt dreadful, as well as moſt injurious of all. It is concerning the *Stile* or *Language* of his *Verſion*. As to which you begin, p. 10. with telling us, what I ſuppoſe no body that knows what Verſe is, can well be ignorant of, "That there are two Sorts of claſſick Language, the Poetical and Proſaick;" and then you add, "That if a Writer ſhould not attend to this Diſtinction, his Stile might be perfectly claſſical, and yet at the ſame time not to be endured." All right. But who could have believed it, if you had not told us, that this is *Buchanan's* Caſe? "He writes, *ſay you*, in Poetry of all Sorts, but his Language is, from the Beginning to the End of the Book, in every Page more or leſs, all *Tully's* Proſe." I would gladly, and that rather for your and the Reader's ſake, than for any Danger that I apprehend to *Buchanan's* Character from it, entirely paſs over what follows. But that I may not ſeem to overlook any thing that you may think will diſparage that Author, I ſhall ſet down the remaining Part of that ſtrange Paragraph, p. 10. and 11. "This, (*ſay you*) i. e. that *Buchanan's* Language is not truly poetical, but *Tully's* Proſe, is too evident to admit of the leaſt Diſpute. *Pſalm* the firſt, *Seſſor cathedre peſtifera* is not to be look'd upon as poetical La-

"in,

“ *tin*, any more than *scelerisque coarguet orbem*; but *frang-  
 “ dum anfractus* is enough to frighten all the Inhabitants  
 “ of *Parnassus*. Cicero indeed, to conclude a Paragraph  
 “ in a full founding Manner, may say, *Quid opus est cir-  
 “ cuitione & anfractu?* de Div. ii. 61. But *anfractus*, in  
 “ any Line of *Virgil* or *Horace*, is not to be found. In  
 “ the second Psalm, *dirumpimus* and *demimus* make a  
 “ strange Figure. But when we come to Psalm the third,

“ *Quam perditorum firma conspiratio*

“ *Conjurat in meum caput!*

“ *Et asseverant, &c.*

“ Is this Poetry? Is this Lyrick Poetry? (*Perditorum con-  
 “ spiratio conjurat in meum caput & asseverant.*) Is it not  
 “ as barbarous a Jargon as to *Latin* Poetry, as Man can  
 “ devise? In the same Stile is a Passage already quoted  
 “ on another Account;

“ *Opinionum foeda mentem toxico, &c.*

“ And innumerable are the Passages of this Kind through-  
 “ out *Buchanan's* Translation of the Psalms: And tho'  
 “ all this, or most of it, may be *Tully's Latin*, it is not  
 “ in any manner Poetry. *Tully's* Poetry itself was bad  
 “ almost to a Proverb; is it possible then to make good  
 “ Poetry out of his Prose?” Terrible! where are we  
 now? The famous *Buchanan*, who has to this Time  
 been look'd upon as the greatest Poet that has appeared  
 since the Restoration of Learning, and for many Ages be-  
 fore it, is now not only thrown down from that high Di-  
 gnity, but found to be no Poet at all. Bless me! Is it  
 possible that so many, I may say all learned Men, his  
 greatest Enemies as well as Friends, in all Places, and  
 about two Centuries, should all be so vastly mistaken a-  
 bout him? And yet, Sir, this, if what you say of him is  
 true, must certainly be the Case. Whatever Grounds  
 you may fancy you have for such a Persuasion, yet you'll  
 allow me to tell you, that nothing short of a mathemati-  
 cal Demonstration, or till I come to the Condition of  
 that *Bedlamite*, who thought himself the only wise Man,  
 and that all the World about him were Fools, shall ever  
 induce me to believe it. Ay, but you will say, You have  
 prov'd it. But you will allow us to consider your Proofs.

You



You talk much of a poetical Language, and I think I have pretty fully explain'd above, wherein that chiefly consists. But, among all its Ingredients, I never dream'd this to be one, that it should be a complete Dialect by itself, and that no Prose Words should enter into it. Something indeed like this is said of the *Italian* Poetry; but I am sure it is far from being true of *Greek* and *Latin* Poetry; or if ever it was, such Works are lost. That the poetical Stile or Diction should in the main differ from ordinary Prose, either historical or oratorical, is by all agreed on: But that, however, does not require, that the Words, or even Phrases, should be all new, and such as are not also used in Prose. The chief Difference between them lies in this, that in Prose they are commonly used in their plain and natural Signification; but in Verse they are oftentimes taken in a Sense somewhat varied from, but still analogical to the former, by a metaphorical or figurative Use of them. Thus *rideo*; *gemo*; *amo*, *audio*, &c. are Words of a plain Meaning, when applied to Men or other Animals; and it is generally a Fault in common Discourse to use them otherwise: Whereas in Verse it is not so, but on the contrary a great Beauty, to give them a new Turn, by applying them to inanimate Creatures, which are no way capable of them but in a figurative Sense. Thus a Poet will say, *Ridet ager*, *Arbor gemit*, *Amat janua limen*, *Non audit currus habenas*: But I doubt if an Orator, far less an Historian, will be allowed to speak so. But here there are three things carefully to be adverted to.

1. That besides those bolder Figures and Metaphors, which are almost peculiar to Poetry, there are innumerable others in all Languages, of a lower kind, which are common to Prose and Verse, and may be almost promiscuously used in both. Nay of such vast Extent are these *Metaphors*, that a great Part of, I may say, all Languages are made up of them; of which it would be idle in me to give Examples.

2. That, though the poetical Diction chiefly consists in the frequent Use of Figures, Epithets, and others above mentioned; yet that does by no means hinder, but

that the Poet may not sometimes, nay oftentimes, speak plain, and use both Words and Phrases in their natural Signification, the same Way as the Prose-Writer does. Thus *Virgil*, though in one Place, by a strong Figure, he says, *Ardebat Alexin*; yet in another he says, *Phyllida ante alias*, without any Figure at all. And so, *Accendere ignem*, and *accendere bellum*; *nectere nodum*, and *nectere moras*; *effundere vinum*, *fletus*, and *effundere vitam*, *voces*, *tela*, and more boldly, *Irarum effundit habenas*, and innumerable such like.

3. A judicious Poet will (as I have often said) duly consider the Nature of the Subject he is upon; and accordingly raise or lower his Style, use more or fewer, stronger or weaker Figures, Epithets, &c. as the Argument he treats of, not only in general, but in the particular Parts of it, shall require. And this, by the by, holds equally true in *Oratory*; in which, besides the general Variety that may be in the Subject of the Discourse, whether it is of the *demonstrative*, the *deliberative*, or the *juridical* Kind, Care also must be taken that the Style be suitable to the several Parts of it. For in what is called the *Exordium* and *Narratio* in the *juridical* Kind, the Orator's Diction must be comparatively more plain and simple, than when he comes to the *Probation* of his own, or *Refutation* of his Adversary's Arguments. But when he has come to what is called *Peroration*, which is much the same with what we call the summing up of the Evidence, then the Orator is in a particular Manner to exert his utmost Strength; and in order to move the Affection of the Judge, and to draw him over to his Side, he is to attack him, as it were, with a *Torrent of Eloquence*, i. e. with a Train of lofty, bold and daring Words, Phrases, Sentences Figures, Epithets, and all the other Instruments of Persuasion. In this (though there is a Difference between them) yet the *Poet* and *Orator* do very near approach to one another. *Est finitimus oratori poeta*, says the great Prince of *Latin* Eloquence; and the famous Archbishop of *Cambray* does not stand to attribute a kind of *Enthusiasm* to the one as well as the other. For this Reason it is, that *Theophrastus*, and after him the above-mentioned

*Cicero*,

*Cicero*, as well as *Quintilian*, recommend very warmly the Reading of Poetry to Orators. *Namque ab his* (says the last of these) *& in rebus spiritus, & in verbis sublimitas, & in affectibus motus omnis, & in personis decor petitur.* *Inst.* x. i. 3. How unjust then is it in you, to blame *Buchanan* or any other Poet, for borrowing some Words or Phrases from *Cicero*, when *Cicero* was so much obliged to Poets for them.

4. I might add in the 4th place, what I have also noted above, the Difference that will arise to the Poet's Style, from the Kind of Verse he makes choice of. Thus in particular, the *Iambick* (in which most of the Words you quarrel in *Buchanan* occur) does admit, nay often require, that the Words and Phrases be generally of the lower and more simple Kind, and such as are usual in common Discourse. For, as *Cicero* himself observes, *Maximam partem ex Iambis nostra constat oratio.* It was therefore no Fault in *Buchanan* to use common and ordinary Words, whether taken from *Tully* or any other good Prose Author, in that Kind of Verse especially, which of all others comes nearest to Prose.

I might have enlarged upon this Head, but I hope, that when what I have said are put together, and duly attended to, that your long and bloody Invektive against *Buchanan*, as if all or most of his Translation was *Tully's* Latin, and not in any manner Poetry, will evanish into Smoke or nothing.

As to the Fling you subjoin, of *Cicero's* Poetry being bad almost to a Proverb, I confess that Line of his,

*O fortunatam, natam, me Consule, Romam,*  
was condemn'd as bad in his own Time, and afterwards by *Quintilian*, *Juvenal*, and others; though *Turnebus* and *Scaliger* find no Fault in it. But whatever is in that, you who are so much taken with your *Alliterations*, *Assonancies* and *Rhimes*, ought to approve it; for in it you have Examples of them all. That he was a bad Poet in general, is much doubted. *Ferrerus Pedemontanus* has, in a particular Treatise on that Head, said a great deal to prove him a very good one. This is certain, that from the recommending of poetical Writings to young



Orators, which I mentioned above, and the many Citations we have in his Works from both *Greek* and *Latin* Poets, it appears that he had a Taste that Way. And though he was surpassed by those of the *Augustan* Age, yet his *Aratea*, and the other *Fragments* we have of his Poetry, may satisfy us that he was hardly inferior to any *Latin* Poet that lived before him.

But be that as it will, what is *Buchanan* concerned in the Matter? Did he read no Author but *Cicero*? We will soon see, by your quarrelling him for borrowing Lines from *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Ovid*, &c. that he had made these Poets pretty familiar to him; and 'tis very odd, that he that was so much conversant with them, has made such frequent Use of them, and has wrote as many Lines, I believe, as any of them, and in more different Kinds of Verse than all of them, should yet after all not understand their Language, and not know how to distinguish the *poetical* from the *prosaick* Style.

But let us look back a little to the Particulars you instance. *Sessor pestiferæ cathedræ*, you say, is not to be look'd on as poetical *Latin*. Why so? Are not these three Words to be found in *Latin* Poets? Has not *Horace* *sessor* and *cathedra*, and *Virgil*, *Ovid* and others *pestifera*? But all the three are not to be found together. What then? Probably if they were, you would have accused him of *Plagiarism*, as you do unjustly on other Occasions. But perhaps you do not like the Construction of *Sessor cathedræ*. Though I see no Fault in the Construction, yet it is rather poetical than prosaick. The Word *sessor*, I am sure, unless all my Indexes deceive me, is not in all *Cicero*.

Your second Instance of the like Kind is, *Scelerisque coarguet orbem*. They are all good *Latin* Words. *Virgil* has, *Argue me timoris*; and might he not have said, *Argue sceleris*. But *Buchanan*'s great Fault is, that he uses the Compound *coarguo*, which *Cicero* happens to have, *Virgil* not. And is that to be suffered!

Your third Instance is something pleasant. *Buchanan* has *Anfractus fraudum*, which you say is enough to frighten all *Parnassus*. *Cicero* has *anfractus*; but *anfractus* in  
any

any Line of Virgil or Horace is not to be found. What then? Do not *Lucan*, *Val. Flaccus*, and *Claudian* use it? And did not they know the poetical Language? But unluckily for you, it is to be found even in *Virgil* himself, *Æn.* xi. 522. and *fraudi* not far from it:

*Est curvo anfractu vallis accommoda fraudi.*

And, which is also remarkable, it is there used in its plain Sense, but in *Buchanan* in a figurative, that is, a more poetical one. You at last became sensible of this Blunder, and correct it among the *Errata* after your *Conclusion*, but in such a Manner as not to quit your former Pretext; for you add, COUPLED WITH SUCH A ROUGH WORD as *frandum*. But had it been so coupled in *Johnston*, it would have made a beautiful *Assonancy* of *fra*, *fra*; a thing you are much in Love with. But what *Roughness* is there in *frandum*, that no other Word, at least a rough one, cannot come near it? We have found that in *Virgil* there are only two Words between them; and in *Æn.* vii. 552.

—*Terrorum & fraudis abunde est*, we have a Word almost close at it, at least as rough, and much more frightful than *anfractus*. And cannot two or more rough Words come together, when a rough thing is to be described? and what more rough, than the *cross*, *crooked*, *rugged*, *perverse Ways of wicked Men*? which therefore (as here in *Buchanan*) ought to be express'd in Words of a rough Sound, i. e. such as bear a Resemblance to them. So that what you condemn here in *Buchanan* is really a great and singular Beauty. What then are such Triflings good for, but to make us both be laught at, you for moving, and me for heeding them?

But I must follow you to your fourth Instance, viz. *dirumpimus* and *demimus*, which you say make a strange Figure. But what is it that is so strange in them? Are not *dirumpo* or *disrumpo*, and *demo*, good Latin Words, and used by good Poets? Does not your *Johnston* use *dirumpam*, *Pf.* lxxxix. 3. and *disrupit*, *Pf.* cxxix. 4.? and is there any thing more common than *demo*, *deme*, *deme-re*, &c. in the best Poets? But none of them have *dirumpimus* and *demimus*. Are you absolutely sure of that? and though you were, what then? Is there any thing more

harsh to the Ear in those Plurals, than in those of *Virgil*, *Æn.* ii. *irruimus, sternimus, vadimus, conserimus, demittimus, incurrimus, fudimus, agitavimus, cernimus, convellimus, impulimus, &c.* the greater Part whereof, I believe, are not now to be found in that *Person* in any other Author; and if they had not been found in him, had it been unlawful to use them?

Your *fifth* Instance is from *Ps.* iii. on which you make a hideous Outcry. *Quàm perditorum, &c.* "Is this Poetry? Is this *Lyrick* Poetry? Is it not as barbarous a Jargon, as to *Latin* Poetry, as Man can devise?" But where lies the *Barbarity* or *Jargon* of it? Are not all the Words truly classical, and most of them used by good Poets? And if *conspiratio* and *asseverant* are not now to be found in them, is the Use of them therefore interdicted, when there is, as here, a proper Occasion for them? But see what I have said of them above *p.* 69.

Of your *sixth* and last Instance from *Ps.* liiii. which you say in general that it is in the same Style, *Opinium fœda mentem toxico, &c.* both you and I have spoke already on another Account; see *p.* 137. But where the *Unpoeticalness* (if I may be allowed the Use of that Word) lies, I am utterly at a Loss to find out. They are all good *Latin* Words, and to be met with in the best Poets. Besides, the *fœda mentem*, and *contaminata corpus*, are poetical ways of speaking, very rarely used by *Historians*, and never by *Orators*, so far as I know of.

As to the innumerable Passages you say there are of this kind throughout *Buchanan's* Translation, it may, I think, sufficiently appear from the fine Swatch you have now given us, how little your Exceptions to them are to be regarded.

But, above all Men, you ought to have been more sparing and cautious in upbraiding *Buchanan* for these things, when you could not but know that your dear *Johnston* is much more obnoxious than the other, on that Score. For in what good Poet (and of some I may say in what good Author) do you find *intricabar, perdius, illicitis, decrepitis, typhus, combinans, sequestratus, aviterus, nomenclatura, archivis, seductus* for *deceptus, perjureratus*



*ratus* for *perjurns*, &c. ? of which see more fully above, p. 76. & *seqq.* which yet after all I will not (in your dictatorial manner) take upon me to condemn, as not knowing what Indulgences are to be allowed to great Poets in these things.

You next proceed to what you account another Imperfection in *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, *viz.* his *expletive*, *useless Epithets* and *Phrases*, as you call them. This Imperfection has been taken notice of, as by others, so particularly by the learned *Dr. Trapp*, in his *Prælectiones poeticae*, vol. 1. p. 137. who yet is obliged to confess that *Virgil* and *Horace* have several such *Epithets*, and that *Homer* abounds with them. It can therefore be no great Fault in *Buchanan*, that he took that Freedom which the greatest of Poets took before him. But of this afterwards. To speak more directly to the Point, I agree with *Dr. Trapp*, in the ingenious Account he gives of *Epithets*, p. 126. & *seqq.* and the Rules he lays down to be observed in the right Use of them. I acknowledge with him, that when justly and in due Measure applied, they constitute one of the greatest Beauties in Poetry: That these of the best Kind are such as are no way essential to their Substantives, but add Ideas quite new and distinct to them: And next to these, such as, though they come very near to the general Nature of their Substantives, yet do not altogether coincide with them; which therefore may be elegantly enough employ'd to illustrate and explain them, even tho' the Conception they bring along with them add nothing that is new to, or distinct from the Substantives with which they are joined. Of both these kinds he brings some Examples from *Virgil*, and I could produce innumerable from *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, and other poetical Works. And to do Justice to *Dr. Johnston*, he is in no wise defective as to that Particular. The only Difficulty or Difference betwixt us will ly in the third kind of *Epithets*, *viz.* such as perfectly coincide with the Signification of their Substantives, and add nothing new to them. To insert such as these, *Ut carminis solummodo lacunam adimpleant, quando prorsus inutilia sunt & supervacua, & res subjecta per istas voces nec promovetur, nec*

augetur, nec illustratur, vitium est in scribendo ferè maximum, & fieri vix potest ut in gravius quis incidat. That it is an Imperfection, and strictly speaking has somewhat incongruous in it, to use such Epithets, I shall allow; yet, however much he exaggerates the Matter, I shall never be induced to believe, that it is so gross a Fault as you and he represent it. Dr. Trapp himself, notwithstanding what he says here, does afterwards, p. 139. alleviate and excuse the Use of such Epithets. For after he has told us, that *Virgil* and *Horace* have some such redundant Epithets (as he calls them) he adds, *Quicquid de iis Epithetis statuendum sit, (Horatium enim vel Virgilium improbare mihi religio est) certum est illos licentiam hanc sibi non nisi parè ac rarò permittere*: And then, (as he cannot but own that they are very frequent in *Homer*) he subjoins this Apology for them: *Atque istius forsàn seculi scriptores Homerum tantà superstitione venerabantur, ut etiam vitia illius interdum esse imitanda duxerint*. But had this been so great a Crime in Poetry, as that he hardly knew a greater, is it to be thought that the Princes of *Greek* and *Latin* Poetry would have so often been guilty of it? *Quintilian*, who knew both the Beauties and Deformities of Poetry, as well at least as either you or Dr. Trapp, is of another Mind, and hardly thinks there is any Fault in them at all. His Words, *Inst. Orat. lib. viii. cap. 6. are: Ornat orationem epitheton, quod rectè dicimus Appositum, à nonnullis Sequens dicitur. Eo poetæ & frequentius & liberius utuntur. Namque illis satis est, convenire verbo cui apponitur, itaque & dentes albi & humida vina in his non reprehenduntur. Apud oratores, nisi aliquid efficitur, redundat\**. Whence we see, that he allows a Liberty to Poets in this Matter, which he denies to

---

\* Bern. Parthenius Spilimbergius, in his excellent Treatise above-mentioned, is of the same Opinion. For, speaking of these Epithets, *Sunt hæc* (says he) *etiam Oratoribus apta, sed ita ut iis non multum indulgendum existiment; in frigiditatem enim, si nimii fuerint, labuntur. Sunt certè quædam horum genera, quæ nequaquam illos deccant, præsertim si importuna fuerint, si longè ducantur, aut si crebrius ea inculcent atque inferciant. Quamobrem nisi illa gravitas insit, quam Emphasim nominant, in soluta oratione minimè utemur. Læterior Poeta est: huic licet dicere, Lac niveum, aurum silvum, quod apud illos vitio carere non potest.*

to *Orators*. And the Reason is plain, *viz.* that it is easy to the latter to forbear it, which to the former it is not. The Orator may use such Words, and range them in almost what Form he pleases; but the Poet has so many Things to look to at once, the Justness of the Sentiments, the Quantities of the Syllables, the Harmoniousness of the Numbers, and the like, that it is extremely difficult to avoid the making use of such *expletive* (as you call them, and (as *Quintilian* and *Dr. Trapp*) *redundant* Epithets.

But it is now proper that we should more particularly consider the one Instance brought by *Dr. Trapp*, and the many, by you, of such *superfluous Epithets* in *Buchanan*.

That which *Dr. Trapp* brings, and runs down as a gross Fault, is in *Pf. cxxxvii.* where *Buchanan* has twice *liquida aqua*. Of which he says, *Non opus fuit, ut vel semel, multò minus trium versiculorum spatio, bis admone-remur aquam esse liquidam: rem ita habere norant omnes; neque per istud epitheton vel minimè illustratur res quam describit Poeta.* As to such *Repetitions* (which by the by is here at a greater Distance than he represents it) I am to speak afterwards. As to the Epithet *liquida*, as here applied by *Buchanan*, I shew'd long ago, that it is very far from being superfluous, and that, on the contrary, it much illustrates the Substantive it is added to; as it is there to be taken, not for *fluida* or *humida*, the essential Property of *Water*, but for *pura, limpida, or defecata*. The very learned and ingenious *Authors* of the *Lipsick Acts* add another Signification it may be taken in, in this Place, not inherent and peculiar to all Kinds of *Water*, namely, *non stagnans, aut aegrè se loco movens; sed leniter devolvens & prono veluti alveo decurrens.* Whether *Buchanan* meant the Epithet *liquida* in this Sense, in both or either of these Places, I will not affirm; but I think it certain that he used it in the other Sense for *pure and clear*. *Tule* in his *Ecphrasis* so renders it, and you yourself acknowledge it, *p. 32.* Nay, the Addition of it is so far from being a Fault, that I am absolutely of the *Lipsick Gentlemens* Opinion, who think, *hand parum decoris ad-*  
*emptum*



*emptum iri in carmine nobilissimo, si ex vocibus liquidas & liquidæ vel alterutra vel utraque expungeretur.*

Come we next to those useleſs Epithets which You bring Examples of from Buchanan. They are, *Pſ. i. 6. Scelerata impietas. iv. 4. Vitiis pravis. vi. 8. Sceleribus impiis. vii. 5. Superbum fastum.* Again, *xviii. 27. Superbos fastus. Pſ. x. 6. Lætis gaudiis. xii. 4. Falsa perjuriam. xxi. 4. Immortalitas immunis mortis. xxvi. 9. Cruentos barbaros. xxxix. 6. Inani vanitate. xliii. 1. Scelere impio. li. 9. male culpæ. lv. 13. Arcani taciturni. lxii. 10. Opes abundant affluenter. lxiv. 8. Toxicam virosæ linguæ. xcii. 15. Male injuriæ. cvii. 29. Tranquilla silentia taciti ponti. cxlvi. 8. Æquam justitiam. cxlix. 4. Mittem mansuetudinem.* As to which, I answer,

1. That there are several of them which do not come under the Description that you and Dr. Trapp give of such Epithets, viz. by which the *res subjecta* (as he expresses it) *nec promovetur, nec angetur, nec illustratur*; or, as elsewhere, which coincide with the general Nature of their Substantives, and add no new and distinct Conception to them. For of this Kind I will by no means allow these following to be.

(1.) *Scelerata impietas.* For all *impietas* is not *scelerata*, or breaks out into grievous Crimes, (as the original Word *scelus* imports.) There have been, and are, many impious Persons in the World, i. e. void of all Religion, who yet were not guilty of notorious Wickedness; nay, some have been commended for their Virtues, as the late Mr. Collins and others. Not but that *impietas* (if not otherwise restrain'd) has a natural Tendency to all Kinds of vicious Practices.

(2.) And this holds true of another Instance, *sceleribus impiis*, i. e. such Crimes as proceed from an impious and irreligious Principle. King David's Crimes of Adultery and Murder did not proceed from Impiety, as those of Saul, Doeg and his other Enemies did; for he had not cast off all Fear of God, as they had.

(3.) *Superbum fastum.* For, as I take it, Pride is the vicious Disposition of the Heart, *fastus* that external Contempt of others that flows from it. Whence it is that

Pliny,

Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* ix. 35. tho' a Prose-Writer, does not stand to join them together.

(4.) *Cruentus barbarus*. For all *Barbarians* are not bloody and cruel, but some of a mild, generous and merciful Temper.

(5.) *Opes abundant affluenter*. For *affluenter* augments and illustrates the Matter, as it signifies not only that they abounded in Riches, but that they did greatly abound in them.

(6.) So I think *Toxica viroscæ linguae* may be allowed, as signifying a Venom or Poison that proceeded from a Tongue that was, as it were, entirely made up of Poison; or plainly, and laying aside the Metaphor, the vile Slanders of *David's* Enemies, which were uttered by Tongues addicted to spread false Reports of him.

(7.) And I do not know but *justitiam equam* may pass, as signifying not a strict and rigorous Justice, but that which is temper'd with Equity, which the *Greeks* call *ἐπιεικέα*.

(8.) And perhaps the same may be said of *mitem mansuetudinem*. For the Epithet seems to add something to the Substantive; the proper Signification of *mansuetus* (as its Origin from *manus* and *suetus*, *quasi ad manum accedere suetus*, imports) being tame or tractable, in opposition to wild, savage, cruel: But *mitis* carries the Idea somewhat higher, as signifying calm, soft, sweet, pliant, good natur'd, &c. And it can hardly be a greater Blemish in *Buchanan*, especially in Verse, to add *mitis* to *mansuetudo*, than it was in *Cicero* to join *mansuetus* to *mitis*, *de invent. rhet. lib. i. cap. 2. Ex feris & immanibus mites reddidit & mansuetos*; where *mansuetos* is put last, merely for the sake of the Roundness of the Period.

(9.) (10.) and (11.) There is also something to be said for *vitiis pravis*, *male culpæ*, and *male injuriæ*. For all *Vices*, *Faults* and *Injuries* are not alike; some being more excusable, others of a more flagrant Nature; and the Addition of *pravis* and *male* seems to import that these were of the worst and most wicked Kind. *Vitium* is sometimes said of a Thing that is small and slight; and the Lawiers distinguish between *culpa lata*, *levis* and *levissima*,

*visissima*, as they generally add *malus* to *dolus*; and *Ovid* has *injuria brevis*, i. e. *parva*.

Thus of the nineteen Instances you have given of such superfluous Epithets in *Buchanan*, I have shew'd that some of them come not under that Description; and, if I am not much mistaken, I have tolerably accounted for some others, which tho' they do not convey any new Thoughts to the Mind, yet they help to heighten and improve the Signification of their Substantives. All these amounting to thirteen, there remain only six, which, to deal ingenuously, I am not very fond of, *viz.* the *letis gaudiis*, *falsa perjuria*, *immortalitas immunis mortis*, *inani vanitate*, *arcani taciturni*, and *tranquilla silentia taciti ponti*. But then I add,

2. That some of these, and others as bad, are to be found in the best Authors: Such as, the *albi dentes*, and the *humida vina*, noted by *Quintilian*, in *Virgil*; also *cavæ cavernæ*, *duris ossibus*, *alta cacumina*, *longinqua vetustas*, *liquidi lacus*, *montibus altis*, *depressas convalles*, *dura flex*, and such like in the same Author. And I doubt not but a great many such may be met with in *Horace*, *Ovid*, *Propertius*, *Tibullus*; not to mention later Poets, *Lucan*, *Valerius Flaccus*, *Sil. Italicus*, *Statius*, &c. as also in the Greek Poets, *Homer* especially, as we have had *Dr. Trapp* confessing. This certainly is of itself sufficient, if not to vindicate, at least to excuse *Buchanan*; for, as the above cited *Quintilian* expresses it, *Error honestus est, magnos duces sequentibus*. But to be more particular, there are some of these that you blame in *Buchanan*, or very like them, that are to be found in those Authors. Thus for *scelerata impietas*, we have in *Senec. Octav. Ver. 7. furens impietas*. For *falsa perjuria*, we have in *Ovid. Heroid. vii. 67. falsæ perjuria linguæ*. For *scelere impio*, we have *nefandum* and *severum scelus*, in *Lucan. iv. 228. and vii. 766*. For *mala culpæ*, *mala ambitio*, in *Hor. Serm. ii. 3. 18. and mala contagia*, in *Virgil. Ecl. i. 51. For tranquilla silentia taciti ponti*, in *Virg. Æn. ii. 255. Tacitæ per amica silentia Lunæ*, and in *Lucret. iv. 587. Rumpere taciturnæ silentia*, and in *Ovid. Met. vii. 184. Muta silentia noctis*, and in *Statius, Th. i. 441. Tran-*



*Tranquilla silentia noctis.* And I humbly think, that of all these you have enumerated in *Buchanan*, there is hardly one more exceptionable than the *cave cavernæ* in *Virgil*, cited above. But

3. Which ought to silence you, we find some of that Kind in your *Johnston*, and even some that you particularly quarrel here in *Buchanan*: As, *Pf. xii. 3. vano typo. xviii. 5. terrificus horror. xxxv. 6. tenebris cæcis,* and *lxxxii. 5. cæca caligine. xxxv. 22. taciturna silentia. xlix. 15. Gaudia letus agam,* and *xxxii. 11. Gaudia letus age,* (i. e. *to be gladly glad, or joyfully joyful, as you would translate it, as you do in Buchanan, Lætis gaudiis, Joyful Joys.*) *li. 2. Turpe nefas—fœdam noxam. liv. 3. Fera barbaries—violenta tyrannis. lviii. 3. Devius error,* and *so cxix. 118. xcvii. 2. opaca umbra. cii. 3. tristis dolor. cxix. 53. Fastus insolens, and cxl. 2. Indignum nefas.* Not that I condemn all or any of these, for the Reasons given above; but that I think them as faulty as those you have scraped together from *Buchanan*. And tho' I do not like *Immortalitas immunis mortis* in him, yet as little can I approve *sine nocte dies*, *Pf. xli. 2.* in the other; tho' perhaps both may be in some measure excused from that particular *Emphasis* they intended to give to *immortalitas* and *dies*; just as we say in *English*, an *endless* or *never-ending Eternity*, or *Days* that have nothing of *Night*, i. e. *Darkness* or *Cloudiness* in them: For it is of such *Days* that *Johnston* is speaking; not of such as should have no *Nights* to succeed them, as appears by his calling them in the same Line *innubes*: Where, by the by, *sine nocte* is a superfluous Addition. Which Freedom, as we shall see afterwards, you will by no means allow to *Buchanan* \*.

4. And

---

\* Here also I observe, that *Baudozianus*, in his ingenious Book *de re poetica*, lib. iii. fol. 61. speaking of *Epirhets*, gives us this Rule. *In epirhetis*, says he, *fugienda humilitas. Martialis diem sudum seu serenum nominat SINE FÆCE, quem jucundius Propertius SINE NUBE.* *Johnston* (besides the *dies sine nocte* here) has also, for Variety's sake, both the other. *Pf. xxxiv. 12. Qui cupis auratos & sine nube dies:* And *lxxiii. 5. ---puri His redeunt soles, & sine face dies.* In both which, especially the last, the same Thought is again repeated,

4. And lastly, I must not omit to take Notice, that in several of the Examples you bring under this Head from *Buchanan*, you by your Translations make them look worse than they really are. For, whereas he gives us Words agreeing indeed, or approaching very near to one another, in *Sense*, but entirely differing in *Sound*, you often *English* them with Words, whose not only *Sense*, but also *Sound* are almost the same. Thus you render *superbum fastum*, proud Pride; *latis gaudiis*, joyful Joys; *toxica virosæ linguae*, the Poison of a poisonous Tongue; *tranquilla silentia taciti ponti*, the quiet Silence of the silent Sea; *aquam justitiam*, just Justice. This (as every unbiass'd Person must see) makes a very considerable Difference in the Matter. For had *Buchanan* said, *Superba superbia*, *lata letitia*, *virus virosæ linguae*, *silentia silentis ponti*, and *justam justitiam*, he would have done, what you would fain make us believe he really has done; that is, he would have expos'd himself to the Ridicule of all the World. But he having, as all good Authors in the like Cases, made choice of Words, which however they may agree in *Sense*, yet altogether disagree in their *Sound*, has, in this respect at least, sufficiently guarded himself from that Imputation.

As to what you add, p. 12. *that you could have increased this Catalogue in every Page*, you will excuse me to think, that it looks something like a Rhodomantade. For, as by the Catalogue you have given us of such superfluous Epithets, we may readily suppose you would pick up such as you thought would most deserve that Name; so, as I have shew'd that the greater part even of these are not truly of that Kind, we may reasonably conclude, that what you here reserve *in petto* have no better Foundation. 'Tis true, in the Comparison you afterwards make between three *Psalms* of our two Authors, you mention a great many such. But I am hopeful that when we come that length, I shall make it appear that they are all vain and imaginary.

I am not a little surpriz'd at what you call " the last Thing you are to take Notice of under this Head, viz. "*Buchanan's* Stile in the Work under our Hands, which  
" is

" is his great Negligence, in omitting so frequently the  
 " Figures in the Original." Here you repeat what  
 you said you had from the learned *Calmet*, " who a-  
 " scribes the Miscarriage of most Translations of the  
 " Psalms to this very Fault." You add, that " As en-  
 " tire Passages must be produc'd on this Occasion, you  
 " beg Leave to lay but two before the Reader, for fear  
 " of being tedious." What, and of what Kind these *Fi-*  
*gures* are, is not very easy to determine; but because the  
 two Instances you bring from Dr. *Johnston* relate to the  
*Exclamation*, or *O*, we may probably infer, that the O-  
 mission of that is the chief, if not the only thing, you here  
 blame *Buchanan* for. 'Tis true, that in your first Instance,  
*Pf. civ. 24.* we have that *Exclamation* both in the *Orig.*  
 and *Johnston*, *O Lord, how manifold are thy Works! in*  
*Wisdom hast thou made them all.* And,

*O Deus, ampla tæ quàm sunt miracula dextræ!*

*O quàm solerti singula mente regis!*

But *Johnston* has *two*, where the Original has but *one*  
*Exclamation*. In the other Instance, *Pf. cxxxiii. 1.* the  
*Orig.* begins with a *Behold*, but no *Exclamation*, and  
*Johnston* with one,

*O quibus illecebris pax & concordia fratrum*

*Me trahit, & pia qui pectora jungit amor.*

On which Account you say, that his Translation is warmer  
 than the *Orig. itself*.

But what unfair Dealing is this? you pick out of the  
 whole Book an Example or two where it happens that  
*Buchanan* has no *Exclamation*, and *Johnston*, and per-  
 haps the *Original*, has one, while at the same time you o-  
 verlook a vast Number of Places where the Reverse is  
 true. To convince you, at least others, of this, we need  
 only to compare their first sixteen *Psalms*, in which *John-*  
*ston* has the *Exclamation O* but once, but *Buchanan* no  
 less than seventeen times; and the *Original* about double  
 that Number: And, for ought I know, the same Propor-  
 tion may in a great measure hold with respect to all the  
 three throughout the rest of that Divine Work. But as we  
 are here upon *Exclamations*, I can hardly contain myself  
 from using one, by crying out, *O the wonderful and unac-*  
*countable.*



countable Power of Prejudice! O what a strange Influence it has upon us poor Mortals! O how are we so far transported by it, as to think we see Things that are not, and to overlook those Things that are most obvious to our View!

Under this Head you comprehend another Thing, tho' of a very different Nature from that which went before, and which you told us was the last Thing you were to take Notice of with respect to *Buchanan's* Stile. But here, p. 13. as if you had not thought on it before, you raise a new *Objection*, and what (you add) is not a trifling one, to *Buchanan's* Version, namely, "That he always affects to stick in some trite Passage out of *Virgil* or *Horace*, and others, often improperly, and sometimes to the Destruction of the Sense, or at least of the Beauty and Force of the Original." These are hard Words: He affects, and that always—to stick in—a trite Passage—improperly—to the Destruction of Sense—Beauty—Force of the Original. This, with all these aggravating Circumstances, and every Article of them, I absolutely refuse. *Buchanan* indeed, as most Poets before or since, borrows sometimes a whole, and sometimes a part of a Verse from those ancient and standard Writers; and in this your *Dr. Johnston* comes nothing short of him, as I shall shew afterwards. But I utterly deny that ever he does it, far less that he affects to do it, and always too, as you say, but when it is altogether *pat* and *pertinent* to his Purpose. And in so doing he is so far from doing it *improperly*, or to the *Destruction* either of the *Sense* itself, or of the *Beauty* and *Force* of it, that on the contrary he is always sure to hit the *Sense*, as he understood it, and oftentimes to *beautify* and *enliven* it. Nay, I add, that he does it in so easy and natural a Manner, as if it were originally and wholly his own. Let us examine the Matter in the two Instances you give us, which we may be sure are such as you thought would best answer your Design.

The first is the beginning of *Pf. iv.* where, say you, to express O God, he introduces the first Line of *Venus's* Speech to *Jupiter*, in the 10th *Æneid*,

O pater, O hominum Divûmque æterna potestas.

And

And then you add, " Is not this shocking in this Place?

" For what Relation has it to what follows?

" *Sincera mihi conscie mentis.*"

What is it, in the first place, that makes this so shocking? Is it not a proper Address to Almighty GOD to say, *O Father, the eternal Ruler of Men and Angels*; for that is the plain *English* of it? But the same was said by *Venus* to *Jupiter*: And what then? Are we therefore debar'd from applying an Invocation, otherwise so proper and pertinent, to the true God? Because the *Heathen* World called their supposed supreme God, or *Jupiter*, *Optimus Maximus*, than which Appellation nothing can more fitly be attributed to the *Divine Majesty*, are we for that very Reason bound not to use it? If so, then farewell to all religious Worship in the *Latin* Tongue; for we cannot make our Addresses to God in that Language, but in such Words as it affords us for that Purpose. Because the *Heathens* used *Pater, Deus, Numen*, and the like, to their fictitious Deities, must *Christians*, tho' the Words in general are not only harmless, but proper, coin new Words that were never before heard of? And if so, (not to enlarge further, as I might, on this Head) how will you excuse *Alme parens, Rector Olympi, Opifex rerum, Regnator Olympi, Pater omnipotens, Rex cœlicolûm, Rex superûm, Superûm Rector, Superûm pater, Æthereus vindex, Maxime rerum*, and perhaps some others, in *Johnston*, which yet are all borrowed from *Heathenish* Authors? The only thing that seems liable to Exception in *Buchanan* is the Word *Divûm*. But that that Word has been long ago used by *Christian* Poets and others, for *Angels* \* and *glorified Saints*, in the same Sense that *superûm, cœlicolûm* and *cœlitum*, there is none can be

L

ignorant.

\* Nay, in the sacred Writings, the holy *Angels* are call'd bene *Elohim*, or *FILII DEORUM*, as in *Job* xxxviii. 7. And in *Pf.* lxxxix. 7. viii. 6. and xcvi. 7. they are expressly named *Elohim DII* or *DIVI*; and in this, last, *Worship him all ye Gods*, is literally translated by *Arias Montanus* *Incurvate ei omnes Divi*. In the *LXX*. Version it is, *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*, which the Author to the *Hebrews*, i. 6. has followed; and accordingly in our Translation, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*.

ignorant. And it was wrong in you, and plainly contrary to *Buchanan's* Intention, to translate it, of *Gods*.

But the second Reason you give, why this Verse is so disagreeable to you, is, because *it has no Relation to what follows*,

*Sincera mihi conscie mentis.*

This is the most surprizing thing in the World; for at this rate we must say with *Persius*, *Frontem periisse de rebus*, and that all Relations between Things or Words are clean evanished and gone. For if there are any such, where can you, I pray, find any more close than here, *O thou eternal Governor of Angels and Men*, [not eternal Power of *Gods* and *Men*, as you render it †] *who knowest the Uprightness of my Heart*; or as *Dr. Patrick* paraphrases the Words, [*O God of my Righteousness*] *who knowest the Justice of my Cause*. What, I say, more proper to connect the two preceeding Lines with one another, and to introduce what follows, *Have Mercy upon me, and bear my Prayer*, thus rendred by *Buchanan*,

*Da mihi te facilem, & justis pius annue votis:*

Where the *justa vota* answer to *sincera mens*, and the latter is made the Ground of the former. But here I cannot omit taking Notice of a particular Propriety in that Verse of *Virgil*, in which (as is remark'd by the most ingenious

as

---

† In this, tho' *Divum* in *Virgil* is to be understood of *Gods*, (otherwise than in *Buchanan*, where it is plainly meant of *Angels*) yet it is a wrong Translation of him to render *poteſtas*, Power; for to call the supreme *Gods*, the Power of *Men* and *Gods*, is hardly Sense in *English* Language, to my Apprehension. I know we say in *English*, The Powers of *Europe*, for the *Kings* and *Supreme Rulers* of the several Kingdoms and States of *Europe*; yet I know none that say, the Power of *Britain*, *France*, *Prussia*, &c. for the *King* of *Britain*, &c. But it is otherwise in *Latin*, in which the Word *poteſtas* signifies, not only the Authority in the Abstract, but the Person in whom it is vested. For which see Examples in *Sueton. Caf. c. 17.* and *Nero, c. 36.* and *Jævenal. iv. 71. x. 100.* And so it should be taken here in *Virgil*. So *Mons. de Segrais* translates it, *Des hommes & des Dieux arbitre ſouverain*, and in a late Translation, eternal Sovereign. *Rugus*, who renders it *ſempiterna virtus*, is intolerable; which I wonder the more, when he had *de la Cerda* to ſet him right, who ſays it is the ſame with *Plautus's* *Imperator Divum atque hominum*, and *Virgil's* Expreſſion, *Æn. i. 234. O qui res hominumque Dæumque* *Æternis regis imperiis.* — And that of *Homer, Il. ii. 681. Διόττιν καὶ ἀνδράστοιν ἀνδρῶν.*



as well as pious Father *Lamy*, in his *Art of Speaking*, lib. iii. cap. 24.) a great Sadness is to be observ'd by the interrupted Cadence, *O pater, O hominum*, &c. And nothing could more patly answer *Buchanan's* Purpose, it being agreed by all, that this *Psalm* was penn'd by King *David*, when he was under some great Trouble and Distress.

Your second Instance of this Kind is in the 51st *Pf.* Ver. 16 and 17.

*Victimæ si te caperent, dedissem, &c.*

upon which you say, "For the sake of introducing out of *Persius*, *Adhibe hæc & absque Thure litabis*, he drops the *Apostrophe* to God, and makes one to the Readers, which confounds the whole Passage." You could hardly have shewn a greater Partiality to *Johnston*, as we shall see anon, nor Injustice to *Buchanan*, than in these Words. Tho' the Thought in the main is common to the *Original*, to *Persius* and many others, yet there is not one Word of this Passage, borrowed from *Persius*, but one or two, and the last likewise somewhat changed, as will appear by comparing them. *Persius* has it,

*Hæc cedo, ut admoveam templis, & farre litabo.*

*Buchanan*, ——— *Adhibe hæc, & absque Thure litabis.*

You might as well have said that he borrowed it from *Horace*, *Ode* iii. 23. 17.

*Immunis aram si tetigit manus,*

*Non sumptuosa blandior hostia,*

*Mollirit aversos penates*

*Farre pio & saliente mica.*

For tho' the Words are different, yet the Thought is the same in all. In this last *Sanadon* shews that the Word *immunis* must signify pure and untainted. The whole is so excellently translated by the Rev. Mr. *Philip Francis*, that I cannot forbear setting it down,

*A grateful Cake, when on the hallow'd Shrine,*

*Offer'd by Hands that know no guilty Stain,*

*Shall reconcile the offended Powers Divine;*

*When bleeds the pompous Hecatomb in vain.*

But, to return, it was unadvisedly done of you to speak of borrowing from *Persius*, and of *Apostrophe's*; when

*Johnston*, towards the very Beginning of his Work, brings in an odd Phrase of that crabbed Author, *postica sanna*, and that rendred yet more aukward by a strange affected *Prosopopee*, in making *sanna* as it were a Person, and addressing to it by way of *Apostrophe*: for both which there is no shadow in the *Original*. Here indeed in *Buchanan* we have a very elegant *Apostrophe*, which tho' not in the *Original*, yet is address'd to a real Person, and I may say to every Person that reads it. And this is what you cannot possibly find Fault with, who value *Johnston* so highly for such *Apostrophe*'s, and these not authoriz'd by the Text, nor address'd to real but fictitious Persons. These you mention with mighty Commendations, in your *Conclusion*, p. 6, 7, 8. as,

*Et dulces Arabum tesqua rigastis, AQUÆ.*

—— *quæsitæ & tibi, CORVÆ, dapes.*

—— *qui quatis, EURÆ, rates.*

to which you might have added that in *Pf. lxxiv. 8.*

*Fana quot his restant, dicebant, perdite, FLAMMÆ.*

All which I am far from admiring, especially the last; but above all, I think the *postica sanna*, in his 1st Psalm, a very wild one, and the greatest Blemish in all his Paraphrase.

You say "that *Buchanan* drops the *Apostrophe* to God." This is a great Impropriety, to say no worse: For no *Apostrophe* can be made to God, who is always and every where present; whereas all *Apostrophes* are directed from the present to the absent, as the very Name of that Figure imports. In the *Orig.* there is indeed a Change of the Word *GOD* from the second to the third Person, which *Buchanan* has duly observ'd; *Thou, O God, desirest not Sacrifice, &c.* and then, *The Sacrifices of God are a broken Spirit. Victimæ si te caperent, &c.* And, *Hæc Deum placant.* Whereas the Doctor has all in the second Person, *te, tibi and tuam.* So that you have no Reason to boast, that the one has kept closer to the *Orig.* than the other; far less to say, "that *Buchanan* had nothing but "the Scrap of a Verse above-mentioned rumbling about "in his Head." I am so far of a different Opinion, that I know nothing more beautiful in all *Buchanan*, nor in-

deed

deed in almost any other Author, than these eight Lines :

*Victimæ si te caperent, dedissem*

*Victimam: sed te neque sanguis hirci*

*Fusus, aut sacris holocausta placant*

*Addita flammis.*

*Pœnitens fraudum scelerumque pectus,*

*Spiritus fracti, mala cor perosum,*

*Hæc Deum placant: adhibe hæc & absque*

*Thure litabis.*

Here the Repetition of *te* and *te*, *victimæ* and *victimam*, but especially the *placant* in the 3d, and the *placant* with the emphatical Word *hæc* before it, and repeated after it in the 7th Line, have a peculiar Force and Significancy. But I see nothing uncommon in *Johnston's* Version; and, which is far from being commendable, he concludes it with something like a Pun, or a mean and low playing upon Words, *placet* and *placat*, especially in so serious a Subject; which, to me, seems infinitely worse than *Virgil's* *Servataque servas Troja fidem*; which you (and I think very unjustly) elsewhere, p. 44. condemn in that great Author.

III. I come now to the most ungrateful Part of my Task, *viz.* your last Particular, which is to compare these two Authors as to *Verseification* or *poetical Arts*. I call it *ungrateful*, not that I am in the least afraid that *Buchanan's* Character will suffer in this Part of the Comparison, more than it has done in other Things; but because the greatest Part of it is taken up with what I may call the *Bark* and *Outside* of Poetry, and is of all Things the least essential to its inward Worth and Excellency: I mean the long Dance you lead us, with your fanciful *Alliterations*, *Assonantiæ syllabarum*, *Rhymings*, and the like; of which too much has been said already. It is therefore not to be expected, and I am sure my Reader's would not forgive me if I did, that I should keep Pace with you in those Things, the greater Part whereof I account but mere Trifles. It will be more than sufficient that I cast some short Glances at them; and that I insist chiefly on those Things, in which *Buchanan's* Honour is more directly struck at.



You begin, p. 16. with giving the Preference to *Johnston* before *Buchanan* in the Choice of the Verse; of which a good deal has been said already. But here you add, or rather repeat what you had said before, and which, you say, you will *remain by as unanswerable*, "That the *Psalms* in the *Original* being all divided into such small Parts as we see they are, it is not possible to make a good Translation in *Latin Verse*, and at the same time good Verse, except in *Elegiack Metre*. In *Heroicks* or in *Lyrick Measure*, you must either destroy the Verse for the sake of the Sense, or confound several separated Parts together for the sake of the Verse: Whereas in the *Elegiack Distich* there is room enough to express the *Original* in the most poetical Manner, without departing from the Subject, or perplexing the Measure." You'll excuse me, Sir, to think that all this is mere Delusion. For if it were true, that the carrying on the Sense from one Verse to another will confound it, then it would follow, that there ought to be no Poetry in any kind of Verse, but in *Elegiacks*; nay, nor in that either. For the Sense is frequently carried from the *Hexameter* to the *Pentameter Line*, and even sometimes beyond that to a second *Hexameter*; as in that of *Ovid. Heroid. i. 91.*

*Quid tibi Pisandrum, Polybumque Medontaque dirum,  
Eurymachique avidas Antinoique manus,  
Atque alios referam.* —

You tell us, what is indeed true, that the *Psalms* in the *Original* are divided into *small Parts*. And what is it that is not divided into Parts, either small or great? But what is it that makes it necessary, that in a Translation each of these Parts should end the Verse? He must be a very dull Reader, that knows not when the Sense is ended, whether it be in the End or Middle of a Verse. Is not all Language or Discourse made up of Parts, some greater, some smaller; some more, some less connected with what went before or follows after, than others? And in these *Psalms*, are not some much longer than others are? Must they notwithstanding be all comprehended in two Lines, neither more, nor less? This, as it is im-

impossible in the Nature of things, so it is far from being the Case with Dr. *Johnston* himself. For even he, maugre all the peculiar Talent he had this Way, is very frequently forced, for one Verse in the Original, to have sometimes four, sometimes six, and sometimes no fewer than eight Lines. See Examples in *Psf. i. ver. 1. and 3. and Psf. xvii. ver. 14.* not to mention innumerable other Places. And will you say, that in these the Sense is therefore perplexed or confounded? 'Tis true, that it is reckoned a Virtue in *Elegiacks*, that the Sense end with the *Pentameter* Line, and Dr. *Johnston*, it must be owned, has been singularly happy in observing that Rule, which also holds very much true, in all Poems composed in Verses of various Metre. But it is quite otherwise in *Heroicks*, and in some Degree in all Verses that are *Unimembres*, or of the same Kind. For in them it is accounted a Fault, when the Sense and the Verse end too often together. I cannot express this better, than in the Words of the eminently learned Dr. *Hare*, late Bishop of *Chichester*, who, of all that have writ on the Subject, has given the most rational and satisfying Account of the *Hebrew* Poetry. He, in the *Prolegomena* to his Edition of the *Psalms*, after he had confuted *Marcus Meibomius* (who was of your Opinion, by maintaining that every Verse in that Sacred Book did complete the Sense, as also that the whole were composed of *Distichs*) adds, *p. 22. Verum idem ipsa rei ratio clarissime evincit, cum nulla poesis, cujuscunque generis sit, pati possit, ut intra tam arctos limites perpetuo conclusa teneatur. In multis quidem poeseos generibus tantum abest ut hoc in laude ponatur, ut contra, poetarum principes ab eo sedulo cavendum ducerent. Homeri certe & Virgilii poematis gratia longe maxima ex eo conciliatur, quod plerumque sensus cum versu non terminetur, sed porro porroque feratur in secundum, tertium, quartumque aliquando versum, idque imparibus commatum intervallis; ex quo mira oritur rhythmi varietas, cum contraria consuetudo in poetis infra illos positus lectori tedium afferat vix ferendum.* Thus this most ingenious Author, who, you see, stands in a diametrical Opposition to your Doctrine. And I must not omit farther to

observe, that according to him, the original Metre of the Book of *Psalms* consists wholly of short Verses, and these all *Iambicks* and *Trochaicks*: Which not only vindicates, but recommends *Buchanan's* Choice of that Kind of Verse \*, especially the former, of which he has more than of any other Kind whatsoever. Not to mention that in this he has imitated the Custom of the *Latin Church*, the *Ecclesiastical Hymns* (some of which are very ancient) being chiefly composed in *Iambicks*, *Trochaicks*, and such like, and very few in *Elegiacks*, that I know of †. When all these things are duly considered, it will, I think, evidently appear, if not to yourself, yet to all others that are not drawn aside by the same Bias, that *Buchanan* has made the best Choice, and that his Version, both on the Account of the Kind, and the Variety of the Metre he has employed in it, is preferable to that of *Dr. Johnston*.

I know not whether I should take notice of what you assert farther on this Head, viz. “ That he made Use of his various Numbers for no Reason in the World, but to get his Task off his Hands as fast as possible.” And you add, “ That this will appear very plainly, when you come to shew, which you suppose you can very evidently, that every Sort of Verse he has made use of is exceeding bad in its Kind.” This Romantick Conceit of yours, that *Buchanan* wanted to get his Task off his Hands as fast as possible, I have so effectually confuted above, p. 126. &c. that there is no need of saying any more of it. But supposing that Figment true, who told you that the Variety of his Numbers would help him to make the quicker Dispatch? One would think that it should have had a very contrary Effect. This I am sure of, that your middle or low Sort of Versificators generally begin with *Elegiacks*, and most frequently, if not always, use them, as finding that Kind of Numbers most easy

\* By *Buchanan's Trochaicks* I understand not only those long ones which he makes use of in *Pf. cv. cxix. cxxiv. and cxxix.* but those also of the shorter Kind, as the *Sapphick*, the *Euripidean*, and the *Alcmanick*, which are reckoned of that Tribe, and in which several of his *Psalms* are composed.

† See a very large Collection of these *Church Hymns* among the Works of the pious and learned *Geo. Cassander*, from Page 177. to 300.



easy for them. As for *Lyricks*, such Poets seldom venture upon them, as judging them (as they really are) much more difficult, or probably above their Reach. This I myself have had Experience of, in my younger Years, in which I could make a Shift to compose a Copy of *Elegiack* Verses; but when I essay'd to do any thing in the *Sapphick*, *Alcaick*, or *Choriambick* Kind, I found my Genius not equal to it, and therefore wisely gave it over.

The bold Undertaking with which you end this singular Paragraph, *viz.* "That you will *plainly* (and, as you suppose, *very evidently* too) make it appear, that every Sort of Verse *Buchanan* has made use of is exceeding bad in its Kind," is what I am next obliged to consider. Though I own, that there is nothing I can go about with greater Reluctancy; the whole that you advance upon this Head, being a continued Heap of Extravagancies from the one End to the other.

To prove this audacious Assertion, for I can give it no better Name, you begin with telling us, in the same p. 16. "That the Reason why People judge so variously of poetical Performances, is, that the great Doctors in this Science have never laid down any plain Rules, by which the Reader might judge wherein the Excellency they applauded, or the Errors they blamed, consisted." This is somewhat strange, that, among all that numerous Train of Writers upon the Art of Poetry (the *Great Doctors* at least, as you call them, in that Science) both ancient and modern, there is not to be found so much as one, that has laid down plain Rules about it. They *applaud Excellencies*, and *blame Errors*; but they do not vouchsafe to give us their Reasons why they do the one or the other. 'Tis true, there are some Excellencies, as well as Deformities in Verse, which cannot be well described; but must only be felt and perceived by the Ear or Fancy \*. There are others again that fall more directly under the Judgment and Understanding, and therefore are, for the greater Part, capable of having plain and solid

---

\* *Sensus non docentur.* Quintil. Inst. vi. 5.

lid Reasons given for or against them †. We have Directions as to both these Kinds in a great many Writers upon that Subject, and particularly in *Aristotle*, *Horace*, *Hephestion*, *Terentianus Maurus*, &c. besides those of a later Date. And I am much mistaken, if most of them, as they lay down Rules in every thing that is of Moment in Poetry, so also they give plain and substantial Reasons for them, where their particular Natures would admit of them. But you are of another Opinion, who think the Rules they prescribe in that Matter are not so full, nor the Reasons they assign for them so plain, as they ought; and that therefore, in some Measure to supply, no doubt, that Defect, you tell us, *p. 17*. "That you had not long since taken the Liberty to offer some Remarks of your own on this Subject, which you had chiefly collected from Observations which you had made from time to time on the two most celebrated *Roman Poets*." And you add, "That as no body has been so kind to the Publick to offer any other, you must beg leave to make use of them for the present." I am sorry that as yet I have not had the good Fortune of seeing and perusing that your Performance. But if the Rules you prescribe in it are the same with those you now give us, you'll excuse me to say, that to me they appear less plain than these given by the *great Doctors* in this Science, whose Writings you complain of as defective in that Point.

For, to come directly to those your Rules, I find they are the very same you laid down above, *Pref. Disc. p. 30*, &c. and are almost wholly taken up about the *Cæsures* or *Pauses*, *Alliterations*, *Assonancies* of *Syllables*, *Rhymes*, &c. of all which I have fully taken notice already, and shewed that, though most of them are of the least Consideration in true Poetry, yet *Buchanan* has been as observant of them as *Johnston*, or any other modern Poet whatever.

But how come you to say, that the *great Doctors* in the Art of Poetry have not laid down any plain Rules concerning

---

† And yet there are some things, says the same *Quintilian*, *loc. cit.* in which *judicium non magis arte traditur, quam gustus aut odor*.

cerning these? Are not all the Rules you here and above give us, concerning your *Alliterations, Assonancies, Rhymes, &c.* (about which you make the greatest Pother) set down by, and taken from *Pontanus* and *Erythraeus*? And can you say, that you have delivered them more plainly or distinctly than they? I have carefully read over and considered what both you and they have writ on these Heads; and declare, that if there is any Odds in point of Plainness and Perspicuity, they have it. As to the *Pauses* or *Cæsures*, (though I will nor say with you, that the due varying of them is the *Soul* of Verse, especially *Heroick*) yet I frankly own, that the right ordering of them is of great Importance, in most Kinds of Verse, for giving an agreeable Cadence and Harmony to its Numbers. But have not most of the ancient *Grammarians*, and others that have treated on that Subject, as also your *Erythraeus*, given us not only full and plain Descriptions of them, but likewise distinguished them, according to their Places, into *Trithemimeres, Penthemimeres, Hepthemimeres, and Enneemimeres*, to which your *Erythraeus* has added the *Hendechemimeres*; which are all that possibly can occur in *Heroick* Verse? And have not these same Authors told us, which was all they could reasonably say upon the Head, that as all Beauty is made up of *Variety*, so there ought to be a Variety in these *Pauses, i. e.* that it would be nauseous and disagreeable in a long Train of Lines, to have all their *Pauses* or *Cæsures* to fall uniformly on the same Places or Feet. But all this it seems was not sufficient; but you would have them to have proceeded farther, and not only plainly, but minutely to have told us, and have given Reasons for it too, where every one of these *Pauses* in every Verse should have its Place; That is, in other Words, you would have them to be so absurd, as to prescribe Rules, which never were or can be observed by any Poet that ever lived upon Earth.

That I am not here misrepresenting you, will, I think, appear from what you advance concerning these *Pauses* in general; but yet more from the particular Application you make of them to *Buchanan*. And this is what we are now to go upon. In p. then 17. you tell us, "That  
you



“ you have observed, from strictly considering *Virgil*,  
 “ that the Soul (as you think you have formerly call'd it)  
 “ of *Heroick* Verse, in particular, is the varying of the  
 “ Pause or *Cesure*; and that the Pause naturally falling  
 “ on the first Syllable of the third Foot, in that Kind of  
 “ Verse, if proper Care is not taken to prevent this Fault,  
 “ the Verse must be exceeding bad, in spite of all other  
 “ Perfections imaginable, if they should be found in such  
 “ Lines.” What Sense can we well put upon these  
 Words? You tell us that the most *natural* Pause, and af-  
 terwards you call it the *common one*, is that which falls  
 upon the first Syllable of the third Foot. But then you  
 subjoin, that it is a *Fault* to have such a Pause, and that  
 if proper Care is not taken to prevent it, the Verse, in spite  
 of all other Perfections, must be exceeding bad. What is  
 that else than to say, that it is not only a *Fault*, but a  
*gross Fault*, to make the Pause fall on that Place where  
 it most *naturally* and *commonly* falls; and that wherever  
 such Pauses happen to be found, the Verses do thereby be-  
 come exceeding bad? And is it a Fault to follow Nature?  
 I, and I believe most Men with me, always hitherto  
 thought that that Poetry, and indeed every thing else, was  
 best and most agreeable, that was most according to Na-  
 ture. One would be apt to think, from these Words of  
 yours, that you meant that the *common* Pause should be  
 excluded from all good *Heroick* Poetry, and that it is a  
 great Fault ever to use it in that kind of Verse.

Well, but you correct the Matter a little afterwards.  
 For you tell us, that *Heroicks* should have at least two  
 Lines out of the *common* Pause for one in it; and lest we  
 should forget it, you repeat it again, p. 33. But what is  
 this other than saying, that that which is *common* should  
 become *uncommon*? For so certainly it must be, if that  
 which is *uncommon* is to be most frequent, and take place  
 at least twice, where the *common* does but once. But to  
 pass this, which looks very like a Contradiction; whence,  
 pray you, had you this Rule? Not, I'm sure, from any  
 of the great Doctors in this Science, for these you own do  
 not speak plainly on the Head, and I add, that they do not  
 either plainly or obscurely give the least Insinuation of it.

But

But what they have not only overlook'd, but not so much as ever dream'd of, you fancy you have at last discovered from a strict Observance of *Virgil's* Practice in that Matter. And what if *Virgil* has followed that Rule? Will it therefore be just to condemn all other Poets that have not followed it, and to pronounce all their Verses, in spite of all other Perfections imaginable, exceeding bad? In your *Pref. Discourse*, p. 30. you seem to give up *Hesiod*, *Ennius* and *Ovid* on that Account, and I am pretty confident that, according to your Doctrine, all the rest, *Greek* and *Latin*, ancient as well as modern Poets, must undergo the same Fate. Nay I have, as well as you, strictly considered *Virgil's* Versification, and cannot for my Heart discover any such Rule even in him. I will allow you that he has a greater Variety in his *Pauses*, and I may say in his other *Arts of Versification*, than perhaps any of the rest: And particularly in his immortal *Aeneid*, (because I suppose the Loftiness of his Subject more required it) he has made a more frequent Use of the *uncommon Pause*, viz. that on the first Syllable of the 4th Foot, than *Ovid*, or perhaps any other Poet of that Age, as I have very fully shew'd above, p. 93. But it is infinitely so far from being true, that he uses the *uncommon Pause* twice for once that he uses the *common* one, that on the contrary I do affirm, that by taking a *medium* of all his Verses, he uses the *common Pause* 6 and probably 7 times, for one time that he uses that which is *uncommon*.

But you seem to go another Way to work, by confounding these *Pauses* with the *Points of Respiration*, which the *Greeks* call *stypnas*. For in pausing the first five Lines of *Virgil's* first *Georgick* (as I have noted above) you place your *Pauses* after them only: Whereas, so far as I can learn, those that have writ on that Subject understand nothing else by these *Pauses* or *Cesures* (which Name you also give them) but the Syllables that remain after each Foot in *scanning*, without any Regard to the Sense. Of all which having discoursed so fully before, I shall only add here, that if we are to be guided by your Directions, that is, that no *Pauses* are to be regarded in Verse, but such as are also Stops in the Sense, then these *Absurdities* will

will necessarily follow. 1. That Poets should above all things take care that they have no *Comma* or *Stop* after the *Penthemimeres*, or first Syllable of the third Foot; for that is the *common Pause*, and according to you will spoil the Verse. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That they be sure to have some Stop or other in the Sense in every Verse; otherwise if there is no Pause but what lights upon them, there will be no Pause either *common* or *uncommon* in it, and that will make it little better than the former. 3<sup>dly</sup>, That they should avoid too many of these *commata*, or Stops in the Sense; for these will too much increase the Number of the Pauses, as in those of *Virgil*, *Æn.* viii. 425.

*I nunc, ingratis offer te, irrise, periclis:*

*Tyrrhenas, i, sterne acies: rege pace Latinos.*

where we have four in each Line: And I know not but that, as in other Cases, there may be a Fault in Excess, as well as Defect. 4<sup>thly</sup>, That if the *Soul of Poetry* consists in the varying of these Pauses, as you have once and again told us, and that these Pauses are nothing but the *Stops* in the Sense; I see no Difference, as to that Particular, that there will be between Verse and Prose; for this last has also its Numbers, though not fixed and regular as Verse: And should we go through a Parcel of *Hexameter Lines*, and stop nowhere but at the Points or Stops in the Sense, I doubt much if the Hearer will be able to distinguish them from a lofty Piece of Oratory, at least from other Kinds of Verse. To what Purpose is it to speak of *Hexameters* or *Pentameters*, or of the *monocola*, *dicola*, *distropha*, *tristropha*, &c. if they are to be pronounced only according to the Sense, and not their Metre or Numbers? I know that the *English* generally read *Latin*, and also *blank Heroicks* and *Pindaricks*, very much after that Manner\*; but I cannot persuade myself that the old *Romans* repeated their Poems after that Way, for the Reasons assign'd above. I'm sure, if they *chanted* them,

---

\* I granted above, that in Verse, as well as Prose, a greater *mora* or Stop should be made in reading, at these *Points* than in other Places. But that, I think, ought not to hinder but that, together with these, the other Pauses should likewise be observed, which are necessary to give the Verse its due *Cadence* and *Harmony*.



them, or gave them any thing of a *musical Air*, as it is probable they did, that Method could not possibly be observed. But whatever is in all this, can you imagine that *Virgil*, or any of these old Poets, put themselves in Pain, in what Part of their Lines these Points should fall? and particularly that they should so adjust them, as that they should never or very seldom light upon the first Syllable of the 3d Foot? They had so many other things, and those of much greater Moment, to think of, that the marshalling of their *Points* or *Pauses*, in the Manner you would have them, could never enter into their Minds. All that they were concerned about was, to have some *Variety* in them, so as they should not always, or in a great Number of Lines, fall upon the same Places. And this was what would cost them little or no Pain, and which the Prosecution of their Subject would naturally, and almost without thinking on it, bring about of itself.

But I have said so much upon these *Pauses* elsewhere, that I have no Need of insisting any farther on them here. It remains only that we should apply what has been said to *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, in order to the balancing of Accounts betwixt them as to that Particular.

To shew, in your Conceit, the Advantage *Johnston* has over *Buchanan* in *Varying* the *Pause*, you pitch on the first *Psalms* in both, and as to *Buchanan*, you tell us, " That in this Psalm of his we have 22 *Heroick Lines*, the two first not very happily are both paused in the common Manner, so are the 4th and 6th, and next to that the 13th, after which we have 8 altogether in the true School-boy Tone, and another of the same Sort at the End of this Piece, with only one Line between out of the vulgar Cadence. So that instead of having at least two Lines out of the common Pause, for one in it, we are presented with 13 of that Species out of 22, and 8 of them all in a Train following each other :

*Contemtrixque poli: | &c.*

Here you deal very artfully, not to say deceitfully, with us. For sometimes you regulate these *Pauses* by the Measures of the Verse in scanning, and sometimes by the Points of the Sense. This is a Liberty not to be granted you.

you, for certainly you ought to keep uniformly either by the one or the other. If we are to be directed by the former, all the Lines in this *Psalm* of *Buchanan*, (except the 5th, 9th, 10th and 21st) are in the *common* Pause. But if the latter is to be the Rule, (as you make it in *Virgil's* first *Georgick*) then only the 1st, 13th, 14th and 17th are in that Pause; and the 3d, 5th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 16th, and 21st, are in the *uncommon* Pause: And (which is odd) the 2d, 4th, 6th, 15th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 22d (as having no Point, unless sometimes at the End of the Verse) must have no Pause in them at all. Let us next examine the Pauses in *Johnston's* first *Psalm* by these Rules. There are only nine *Hexameter* Lines in it, and you (*Pref. Disc. p. 44.*) take notice of the Pauses in them only. Though, as most, if not all your Pauses, are confin'd to the first Hemistich, and as the Measures of that both in the *Hexameter* and *Pentameter* Lines are the same, I see no Reason why, especially as you manage the Matter, you should overlook them in the one more as the other. But to let that pass, and to keep only to the Pauses of the *Hexameter* Lines, if they are to be paused by the Measures of the Verse, and not the Sense, all of them are paused in the *common* Way. But if we are to be directed by the Sense, or the *Punctuation*, then indeed the 7th Line only is in the *common* Pause, and the 1st, 2d, 4th and 8th in the *uncommon*; and the 3d, 5th, 6th and 9th (as having no Point in them) must have no Pause, except it be at the End of three of them. But see how you play your double Game with us, for in the forecited *p. 44.* of your *Pref. Discourse*, you say that three of them are in the *common* Pause, viz. the 5th, 6th and 8th, and that the other six are all *artfully varied*. But how can you say that the 3d,

*Mente sed atherei meditatur jussa parentis,*  
is in the *uncommon* Pause, (for so you reckon) and yet that the 5th, 6th and 8th, viz.

*Cui tempestivis curvantur brachia pomis :*  
*Illius adspirans votis clementia coeli :*

*Nam probat astrorum Rector vestigia justi.*  
are in the *common* Pause; whereas, according to your Do-  
ctrine,

Erine, as there are no Stops in the Sense, there is not any Pause. But whence is it that the first has escaped the common Pause, which the other three have fallen into? For my part I can discover no Difference between them, but that the first hath two *Dactyles* before the *Penthemimeres*, the second hath two *Spondees*, and the third and fourth a *Dactyle* and a *Spondee* before that *Cæsura*. We see then, that in these you regulate your Pauses by the Measures or Feet, and not the Sense: But in the rest it would seem you direct them by the Sense only. Again, if the 3d *Hexameter* in *Johnston*,

*Mente sed ætherei meditatur jussa parentis*\*,

is out of the common Pause, (for no other Reason that I can possibly see, but that it has two *Dactyles* before the *Penthemimeres*;) then what is it that hinders these two Lines in *Buchanan*, but especially the last,

*Ergo, ubi veridicus judex in nube serena,*

*Nam pater æthereus justorum & fraude carentum,*

(which you have marked as in the common Pause) from being in the uncommon one? For they have two *Dactyles* before the *Penthemimeres*, or the *Semiquinarian Cæsura*, as it is otherwise called, as well as that Line of *Johnston*.

Nay further, if we shall reckon the Pauses to be varied, as oft as the Feet or the *Dactyles* and *Spondees* are put in different Positions in these two Versions, I believe we will find as great, if not a greater Variety in *Buchanan* as in *Johnston*. For, upon Enquiry, I find in *Buchanan's* 22 *Hexameter* Lines the Mixture to run thus:

M

2 *Dact.*

---

\* And yet so inconsistent are you with yourself, that in what you call your *Conclusion*, p. 10. you tell us, that the Pause is made at *ætherei*, that is, at the first Syllable of the third Foot, which is the *Penthemimeres* or common Pause.



		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
2 Dact.	{ Line 1. 18. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 9. 11. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 19. — —	—	—	—	—	—	—
3 Dact.	{ Line 2. 16. 20.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 3. 8. 15. 21.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 10. 13. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 5. — —	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Dact.	{ Line 6. 12. 22.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 4. 14. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
5 Dact.	{ Line 7. — —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 17. — —	—	—	—	—	—	—

In which there can hardly be a greater Variety: For in 5 Lines we have two *Dactyles*; in 13 Lines we have three *Dactyles*; in 3 Lines we have four *Dactyles*; and in 1 Line five *Dactyles*: And all these so interchangeably varied, and at such Distances from one another, that not any two of them, with the same Measures in the same Places, happen to fall together.

In *Johnston's* nine *Hexameter* Lines, the *Dactyles* and *Spondees* are thus mixt.

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1 Dact.	Line 5. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
2 Dact.	{ Line 1. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 4. 6. 9. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
3 Dact.	{ Line 2. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
	{ Line 7. —	—	—	—	—	—	—
4 Dact.	Line 3. 8. —	—	—	—	—	—	—

In which the Variety is sufficient enough, in so few Lines; and 'tis not to be reckoned a Fault, that no Line has 5 *Dactyles*, and that there is none in the 4th Region; both which are found in *Buchanan*.

Though otherwise there was no imaginable Need of such trifling Observations, being perswaded that Poets did seldom or never trouble their Heads either about the Number or the Places of *Dactyles* or *Spondees* in their *Hexameters*, any farther than to shun an *Homotony* in a long Train of them, or that the greater or less Gravity of the Subject might

might require more or fewer of the one or the other. Yet, that I might obviate every thing you may bring against *Buchanan* with respect to your Pauses, and not knowing wherein the Nature of them according to you does consist, whether in the *Distinctions* of the Sense, or the *Cæsures* after any Foot in scanning, or lastly, in the *Feet* themselves (for to all these you seem to refer them, as they make for your Purpose) I thought fit to vindicate him from all the Cavils you have or can raise against him on any of these Heads. If in these I have wearied my Reader, as certainly I have, he has you to thank for it, who have compell'd me to this idle and otherwise superfluous Disquisition.

But, that we may at last talk more rationally of these *Pauses*, I have at large shew'd above, that in Verse, *considered simply as Verse*, which is the only thing we ought to go upon, the most considerable of all the Pauses is that which divides the one Hemistich from the other; and that the only Variety that can there generally happen, is when after the second Foot, there remains one or more Syllables of a Word: That if only one Syllable remains, the Pause lights upon that Syllable; but if two remain, then the Pause is thereby carried a whole Foot forward, and made to fall on the Syllable that remains after the next or third Foot: Or, in other Words, the former lights on the first Syllable of the third Foot, and the latter on the first Syllable of the 4th Foot. I know that there are some Verses in *Virgil*, and other Poets, where neither of these occur; but as such are comparatively but very few, and they upon that Account thought less harmonious, they are not here to be much regarded. As to these two above mentioned Pauses, I have observed that the former of them is vastly more frequent than the latter, and therefore is even by you named *common*, and the other *uncommon*: And that, by the great Inequality we find in the Disposition of them in the best Poets, it would appear that they had no Plot or Design in the Use of them, but generally brought them in by Chance, as they offered themselves to their Imagination. This I have made out above, by a Comparison between *Virgil* and

*Ovid* on that Head; and now it remains, that I should do the same between *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, by which it will appear that even in this (contrary to what you represent) the Advantage lies on the Side of the former. As to the Use then of that most beautiful, though less common Pause, viz. that which falls on the Syllable remaining after Foot third; of that Kind we meet with none in *Johnston's* first Psalm, but no less than four in that of *Buchanan*, viz.

*Sed vite rimatur iter | melioris, & altâ.*

*Exurit, non torret hiems; | sed prodiga lato.*

*Proventu beat agricolam, | nec flore caduco*

*Novit iter, sensumque tenet, | curvosque secuta.*

Which is a greater Number than proportionally is to be found in *Virgil* himself, upon a *Medium* through any one Poem or Book of his together. So little Reason have you to quarrel *Buchanan's* first Psalm on this Head.

But it is moreover very observable, and enough to stop the Mouth of the most obstinate Prejudice, that in *Johnston's* Psalms, besides this first, there are other 34 that want this Pause, viz. the xiv. xxi. xxxvi. xxxix. xlii. xlv. xlvii. lvi. lxxxii. lxxxiv. lxxxvii. lxxxviii. xcii. xciii. c. cxiii. cxvii. cxx. cxxi. cxxii. cxxiii. cxxiv. cxxv. cxxvii. cxxviii. cxxix. cxxxi. cxxxiv. cxli. cxlii. cxlvi. cxlviii. cxlix. cl. Whereas in all the 36 Psalms of *Buchanan*, wherein there are *Hexameters*, either alone or join'd with others, there are only three, viz. the xciii. cxiv. and cxxxvii. that have not one or more of these Pauses; and some have very many, as,

xviii.	} which has of these Pauses	{ 12	} in	{ 128	} Lines.
xl.					
lxviii.					
lxxviii.					
lxxxix.					
civ.					
cvii.					
		{ 9		{ 63	
		{ 15		{ 62	
		{ 18		{ 151	
		{ 19		{ 111	
		{ 12		{ 84	
		{ 14		{ 92	

And here I also remark, (though it more properly belongs to another Head) that there are three of these *Hexameter* Lines,



Lines, which by the unusual Situation of their *Pauses* are wonderfully adapted to express the Sense therein represented, viz. in Psalms

xxiv. *Claustro revellite, | limina pandite, | magnus ubi intret.\**

lxxxix. *In luctu, | in squalore, | ignominiaque senescit.*

civ. *Exsultant, | tot monstra | ingentia & horrida visu.*

In all these we have hardly any *Cæsura*; those in the two last being swallowed up by *Elisions*; but otherwise they may be paused as I have marked them. In the first, by the five continued *Dactyles*, are very naturally expressed the hasty, but interrupted Strugglings and Pullings for to get open the Gates of a Palace or Temple, into which a great King or Commander is to make his Entrance. In the second, on the contrary, by the many *Spondees*, we have represented the dull and languishing State of a Person in great Misery. In the third, both by the many *Spondees* in it, as well as by the high and rough sounding Words *exsultant, monstra, ingentia* and *horrida*, we have as it were laid before our Eyes the hideous and frightful Appearance these Sea-monsters gave to the Beholders.

But, to return to these *Pauses* after Foot third, if we shall proceed farther in balancing Accompts betwixt our two Poets, as to that Particular; it will be found, upon the whole, that *Buchanan* has the greater Number of them. I have been at some Pains to reckon up the *Hexameter Lines*, as also those *uncommon Pauses* where they occur in both Paraphrases, and if I am not mistaken in my Calculation, *Buchanan* has only 1329 Lines, but *Johnston* 2457, which last is near double the Number of the other.

M 3

Again,

\* This is a singular Kind of *Hexameter Line*, of which I have not met with any Example, but that one of *Ennius*, as cited by *Festus Pompeius*,

*Poste recumbite, vœstraque pectora pellite tonséis :*

On which *Hier. Columna*, his Commentator, has this Remark: *Dactylorum frequentia Poeta noster celeritatem commotionemque ipsam propemodum oculis objicit.* The learned *Pet. Baudorianus* has taken notice of this singular Verse in *Ennius*, p. 49. and adds, *Ex quo recentiores versus fecerunt Dactylicos commaticos nominatos, ut Hildebertus Laverdinus, Bernardus Cluniacensis, Wichardus Lugdunensis.* But I have not had the Curiosity of looking for them in those Authors,

Again, the Number of these *uncommon Pauses* that are to be found in *Buchanan's* are about 194, and in *Johnston's Hexameters* about 309. By which it appears, that the *uncommon Pause* in *Buchanan's Hexameters* is to the *common* one as 1 to  $6\frac{1}{2}$ , and in *Johnston's Hexameters* as 1 to nearly 8. So that upon the whole, if there is so great a Beauty in the frequent Variation of the *Pause*, as you give out, *Buchanan* has much the Superiority over *Johnston* in that Respect. But the Truth is, that after all this unnecessary Drudgery you have put me to, the more or less Frequency in changing these or any other *Pauses* is of very small Significancy in Poetry. For it is not to be thought that *Virgil, Horace, Buchanan, Johnston*, or indeed any Poet, sat down to consider beforehand, when and where they should have this or the other *Pause*. These *numeri* were not *quæsitæ*, but *sponte oblata*; and these, as well as almost all the other external Ornaments of Verse, your *Alliterations, Assonancies, Rhymes, &c.* they minded no farther, than as they casually did cast up to their Fancy, or the Matter they were upon did suggest them to their Thoughts\*. To convince us of this we need only consider the great Inequality that is to be found in all of them, as to these *Pauses*. Sometimes in the same Poet and Work, we will find the *uncommon Pauses* very frequent, and almost crowded together; and at other times, for a long Train of Lines, the *common Pauses* only take place. This I have shew'd above with respect to *Virgil* and *Ovid*, p. 91. and could, if there was the least Occasion for it, do the same with respect to *Buchanan* and *Johnston*.

I own that Variety in the *Pauses*, as well as in other things, is one of the chief Beauties of *Verseification*. But then this or that Beauty must not be studied and artificial, like a Piece of fine Architecture, in which every Part must

---

\* At least if they intended any such thing, they artfully dissembled it, according to that Rule of *Quintilian*, lib. ix. cap. 4. extr. *Disimulatio cura præcipua, ut numeri sponte fluxissent, non arcessiti & coacti esse viderentur.* And what that great Author, much to the same purpose, says elsewhere, lib. viii. *Proam.* concerning Oratory, will equally hold good in Poetry: *Majore animo aggredienda eloquentia est: quæ si toto corpore valeat, ungues polire, & capillum reponere, non existimat ad curam suam pertinere.*

must have a certain Form and Position assign'd it. This is what no Language, far less that which is poetical, is capable of. The very Affectation of it is accounted a great Blemish, and that otherwise celebrated Greek Orator *Isocrates* is blamed for his being too anxious in adjusting his Periods, and shewing too much Art in his Compositions \*. It is in this especially that *Quintilian's* Precept ought to take place, and which will hold equally in Poetry as in Oratory, lib. i. 10. *Si qua in his ars est dicentium, ea prima est, ne ars esse videatur.*

I cannot conclude this Period, without taking notice of a Wipe you have at *Buchanan* in the End of it, where, after repeating 8 Lines of his first Psalm, which, say you, have all the common Pause, you add, p. 18. " There are " no Poppies, tho' steep'd in *Lethe*, more soporiferous " than such Lines as these." To which it were enough to answer, that if one must become drowsy by reading these few Lines, I know none that will keep him awake. I am sure the first 8 Lines of the immortal *Æneid* have all the same common Pause; as have also the first 6 of the third Book, the first 6 of the fourth, the first 9 of the sixth of that glorious Work. You see I have not gone far to find out Precedents. But what if I should produce you 17, 19, 25, 28, and once 41 of the same Kind in the first Book of *Georgicks*, the most finished Piece of that same great Author? And might not the 4 Lines of 22 (which you acknowledge to have the uncommon Pause) viz. the 5th, 9th, 10th and 21st, have atoned for these 8 that want it? Ay, but you have a peculiar Art in discovering other lesser Pauses in some Places, the Want whereof renders *Buchanan's* Lines, (to use your Friend Mr. *Lauder's* Word) so *hypnotick*. I have already considered these your lesser Pauses, and though they are in themselves hardly worth noticing, yet I cannot find *Buchanan* more deficient in the Variety of them than *Johnston*, or indeed any

M 4

other

---

\* *Isocrates in Compositione adeo diligens ut cura ejus reprehendatur. Quintil. lib. x. cap. 1.* This was also *Theopompus* his Scholar's Fault, qui cum vocalium hiatum, à quo tantopere *Isocratem* magistrum abstinuisse intelligebat, tantâ curâ vitâvit, hominum reprehensionem vitare non potuit. *Bern. Parthenius* de poet. imit. p. 104.



other good Poet. Nay, if you will be governed by your own Rules, there are two of these 8 Lines, (which you say are apt to lull the Reader asleep, by their being all in the *common Pause*) viz. the 4th and 8th, which are as much in the *uncommon Pause* as the third *Hexameter* in *Johnston's* first *Psalm*, which you will have to be in that *Pause*. [See above p. 177.] Though the Truth is, that in all that *Psalm* in *Johnston*, there is not (as I have noted above) so much as one Line, that is not in the *common Pause*, as well as these 8 in *Buchanan*.

But it is not this alone, that offends you in this *Psalm* of his. For you subjoin, "I could, say you, go on to shew, that all the other proper Embellishments of this Sort of Verse, such as the mixing the singular and plural Numbers, for at the very Beginning we have *animus, trames, contagio, turba, error, sessor and cathedra*, before we come at one plural Number *irrisoribus*) as also the necessary Suspence, the adapting the Sound to the Sense, and the like, are all wanting in this *Psalm*. But this would be a needless Labour, since, as I have just now said, wherever the *Cæsura* or *Pause* is not observed, the *Versification* cannot but be intolerable." What! and must all these your Embellishments be crowded together in the Compass of 22 Lines. This would make them resemble a Cloak patched up of parti-coloured Pieces, or rather like an old *Gothick* Building, where the Ornaments are straw'd so thick, that its other and more substantial Beauties cannot be seen or attended to. That Poetry, not in mine only, but the Opinion of the best Judges, is most agreeable, which, like *Horace's* Mistress, is *simplex munditiis*, i. e. *neat and cleanly*, but at the same time *simple and plain*; and not that which, by a Multiplicity of Ornaments and Gawdiness of Dress, is apt to distract the Thought, instead of delighting it\*. But

---

Thus *Quintilian*, lib. viii. Proem. Corpora sana & integri sanguinis, & exercitatione firmata, ex iisdem his speciem accipiunt quibus vires: namque & colorata & adstricta, & lacertis expressa sunt: sed eadem si quis vultu atque fucata muliebriter comat, foedissima sunt ipso forma labore. And much to the same purpose he had said a little above, Resistam iis, qui omnia rerum

But it is not true that this *Psalm* of *Buchanan* is destitute of all, nay, nor so much as one of these Embellishments.

For, *first*, As to the *Mixture* of the *Numbers*, *Buchanan* indeed has in the first Verse several *Singulars*, as *animus*, *trames*, &c. and I wonder you omitted *iter* as one of them; but then he has mixed one *Plural* with them, *irrisoribus*, which is just as many as are (till you tamper'd with him) in *Johnston*. For he has *consilium*, *scelus*, *grex*, *iter*, *impietas*, *sanna*, and *sedile*, all *Singulars*, and only one *Plural*, *passibus*; till you, for Reasons known to yourself, took the Freedom to change, without any Authority, the *consilio iniquo* into *consiliis iniquis*. But besides the *irrisoribus* in the fourth Line, has not *Buchanan*, *leges noctesque diesque* in the 6th, *ludibria* in the 15th, *moestos vultus* in the 18th, *justorum* and *carentum* in the 20th, and *fraudum* and *amfractus* in the 22d, all surrounded with *Singulars*? If these are not sufficient, it will be incumbent upon you to inform us how many are requisite, and at what Distances, in every set Bounds.

2dly, As to the Suspence, if by that is to be understood the artificial ordering of the Words, or, if you will, the placing the Verb at or near the End of a Period or Clause, the whole *Psalm* is full of such, and particularly the *flexit*, *tenuit*, *revolvit*, *erit*, *lactat*, *veniet*, *tenet*, *peribit*, &c.

3dly, As to the adapting the Sound to the Sense, I shall only give you two Examples, *viz.*

—— subito sed turbine rapti

*Pulveris instar erunt, volucris quem concita gyro*

*Aura levis torquet vacuo ludibria coelo:*

Where the *turbine rapti* express both the *Impetuosity* and *Boisterousness* of the *Wind*, and the many *Dactyles* in the two following Lines represent the *giddy* and *swift Tossings* of

---

*rerum diligētiā; quodam inani circa voces studio senescunt, idque faciunt gratiā decoris, quod est in dicendo meā quidem opinione pulcherrimum, sed cum sequitur, non cum affectatur. Of the same Mind is the famous Isaac Vossius, in that learned Treatise of his, De poematum cantu & viribus Rhythmi, p. 122. Quis est qui nesciat etiam ipsa, si nimia fuerint, sordescere ornamenta? — Cantum (he might have said Poësin) ego libenter volim spemilem iis matronis, quibus nihil decedat, etiamsi universum deponant mundum muliebrem, veluti à natura consecutis quod quovis adscititio cultu sit præstantissim.*

of *Dust* in the Air. The other Instance is in *curvos fraudum anfractus*, where (tho' you elsewhere unjustly find Fault with it on that Account) the *Roughness* of the Words do most naturally express the *rugged* and *perverse* Ways of wicked Men. And it will puzzle you to find such like Examples in *Johnston's* 1st, or perhaps any other of his *Psalms*.

I do not much wonder, that (tho' you insinuate something of it, by adding the Words *and the like*) you do not mention your *Alliterations*, *Assonancies* and *Rhiments*, Examples of all these being so glaring in this *Psal*m, that you could not possibly deny it. But what signify all these Things, when your Rules about the *Casura* or *Pause* are neglected; for be they many or few, if these are not likewise observ'd, the *Verse* is, and cannot but be, in your Account, intolerable? And yet even with respect to these *Pauses*, I have shew'd above, that *Buchanan* (tho' I will not lay such Stress upon them as you do) has a greater Variety than *Dr. Johnston*, not only in this *Psal*m, but through the whole Work.

After all, there are several other *Verse* Ornaments, which (tho' your Friends *Pontanus* and *Erythreus* have taken special Notice of them) you have all along quite overlook'd; such as the *varying of the Position of the Feet*, the *Shortness and Length of the Words*, the *Explosions* and *Composions* they so much talk of, &c. which I suppose you were not ignorant of, but thought fit to neglect, as not furnishing you Matter for railing at *Buchanan*. And yet in this very *Psal*m we have a considerable Variety in most of them. Had these been observed by a nice and critical Head, and particularly the smaller *Pauses* in the second *Hemistich*, which you have entirely past over in Silence, such as those that have the two or three last Feet compos'd of whole Words, and what is call'd the *tetrapodia bucolica*, both mentioned above, p. 94. and 95. and of which we have several Examples in this *Psal*m of *Buchanan*: Such a one, I say, must have got a Doze of real *Opium*, if the Observation of these would not keep him awake.

You



You carry us next to some other of *Buchanan's Psalms*, and first to the Measures in the 2d, where you tell us, "That the first Line is of the same Kind with the former, namely, the Hexameter," *which is true, and every Body sees.* "The second, you add, instead of a pentameter Line, is an *Iambicus Hipponacteus*, (as you are informed) *trimeter acatalectus*, consisting of six Feet, of which the last is always an *Iambic*, (lamb. or Iambus, you should have said) or a *Pyrrhic*, the 2d and 4th are *Iambick* (as before, for *Iambus*) and in its Place pretty frequently a *Tribrach*; but in the unequal Places, that is, the 1st, 3d and 5th, besides the *Iambic*, [*Iambus*] it receives also the *Spondee*, the *Anapest*, *Dactyl* or *Tribrach*." This is a pretty just Description of the *Iambicus trimeter*, (as the *Greek*) or *Senarius*, (as the *Latin* call it) *acatalectus*, save only that you call it *Hipponacteus*, instead of *Archilochius*. But why do you say, *instead of a Pentameter*? Was *Buchanan* obliged to translate this, or any other *Psalms* in *Elegiacs*, because *Johnston* chose that kind of Verse? But to let that pass, I am not a little surpriz'd at the Scheme you give us of that *Iambicus trimeter acatalectus*, which, you say, you *transcribed from a very learned Hand*: For alas! either he or you have quite mistaken the Matter; the Scheme you have copied from him, representing not the *Iambick* of any kind, but what is the Reverse, the *Trochaick*, and that not *trimeter acatalectus*, (for of that sort I remember none, in any good Poet) but the *tetrameter catalectus*, i. e. that which has seven Feet and the half of the eighth, whence it got the Name of *catalectus* or *catalecticus*. But it is something odd that in the plain Scheme you give us of an *Iambick* Verse, you have not an *Iambus* in all the Varieties you give us of it. But it would seem that these *Pauses*, *Alliterations*, &c. (about which however no Laws can be assign'd) have lien so near your Heart, that you did not think it worth while to be careful as to the Measures; in which the very *Essence* of *Verseification* is indispensibly concerned.

What you say further on this and *Pf. 3d*, is little else than a Repetition of what you had boldly asserted, and I

as

as effectually confuted above, and therefore deserves not to be any more insisted on.

When you come to *Pf.* 4th, after describing the kind of *Metre* it is of, you pass over the 1st and 2d Verses, and give for an Example, *Ver.* 3.

*Quem Deus electum miro dignatur honore,  
Per discrimina cuncta tuetur.*

*Me Dominus clamantem ad se, auxiliumque rogantem  
Mitis & exorabilis audit.*

and after having given the *Orig.* of it, in our common Translation, you add, *p.* 20. " that notwithstanding " the Variety of the *Metre*, you believe the Generality " of Readers, even amongst the Learned, will be apt to " prefer *Johnston's Elegiack Lines*,

" *Elegit fulcitque pios Pater ætheris alti.  
" Ne dubita, questus audiet ille meos.*"

What you mean by, *even amongst the Learned*, I know not. I suppose that it was to the *Learned*, and those only, *i. e.* to those that had Knowledge and Capacity to pass a right Judgment upon them, that both Poets submitted their Performances; and that if these were satisfied, they were no way in pain what might be the Opinion of the Generality of other Readers concerning them. But what is there in *Johnston's* Translation that should make it preferable to *Buchanan's*? It would seem, by your setting down the *Orig.* that the Point of Preference lies in the more close Correspondence that the former bears to it than the latter. But you will allow me, as in most other Things, to differ also from you in this. It is agreed by all the Commentators I am acquainted with, *Vatablus*, *Hammond*, *Patrick*, *Wells*, &c. that by the Word, which we render *Godly*, the *Septuagint* ὁσιος. Others *sanctum*, *pium*, *probum*, *beneficum*; and, which comes nearest to the *Hebrew*, as I am told, *misericordem*, is meant King *David* himself, and him only. Nay, *Vatablus* tells us, that *Vox Hebræa passivè accipitur pro eo in quem misericordia exercetur*. If this is true, I think it obvious that *Buchanan* has the Advantage in naming him *electum*, and *miro honore dignatum*: Whereas *Johnston* has brought in promiscuously all *pious Men* in the plural

Num.

Number, which, tho' true, was not the *Psalmist's* Intention. There are other Things in which, in my Opinion, *Buchanan's* Version deserves the Preference: But I pass over them, and come to

What you seem more to have in View, and very oddly, as well as confidently, affirm, p. 20. in which you ironically tell us, "That the Author's [*Buchanan*] Judgment cannot be too much admired, in placing between the two *Hexameter* Lines just mentioned such a Verse. All the three stand thus,

" *Tu meus es, genui te hodie, me posce, daboque.*

" *O pater, O hominum Divumque aeterna potestas.*

" *Me Dominus clamantem ad se, auxiliumque petentem.*

" Here, you say, is one of *Virgil's* most sublime sonorous Verses placed between two of the most miserable, distorted, hobbling Lines, that ever any Mortal writ, and as oddly introduced as possible in another Respect." Ah! poor *Buchanan*! From what an Height, and how low art thou now fallen? But take Courage, Man! for all these are *bruta fulmina*, which may well rebound on the Thrower, but cannot in the least hurt thee. For, not to mention what you say of that Line of *Virgil's* being oddly introduc'd, I having shewn that no Line either of *Virgil's* or *Buchanan's* own composing, could be more beautiful, or more apposite, than that is, in the place *Buchanan* has given it: Not, I say, to mention this,

1<sup>st</sup>, It is a strange Application of the Word *BETWEEN*, to say twice that *Buchanan* has plac'd that Line of *Virgil* *BETWEEN* two of his own. Who would not understand your Meaning to be, that these three Lines stood close together, as you have put them? Whereas in fact it is quite otherwise; the 1<sup>st</sup> being in the middle of the Second *Psalms*, the 2<sup>d</sup> in the beginning of the Fourth, and the 3<sup>d</sup> fourteen Lines after. You might with equal Propriety have said, that *Germany* lies between *Muscovy* and *Spain*; or *Italy* between *Guinea* and *Scotland*; or, if you will, *Denmark* between the North and South Poles.

But 2<sup>dly</sup>, What is there so offensive in these two Lines  
of



of *Buchanan*, as to make them deserve these most wretched Epithets you have bestowed upon them? I cannot for my Heart see any thing *distorted* or *hobbling* in them. That you judge otherwise, must it seems be owing either to the *Elisions* that are in them; or perhaps you pronounce the Word *hodie*, as Boys at School do commonly with us, by cutting off the last Letter, and so making it a Dissyllable *hodi*: Which is a Fault, no body that understands the Language can be guilty of. As to the *Elisions*, what more harsh here than in that of *Martial*,

*Sera nimis vita est crastina, vive hodie?*  
or in that of *Virgil*,

*Nunquam hodie effugies, veniam quocunque vocaris?*  
there being two *Elisions* in each.

As to *Buchanan*'s 2d Line, I would have expected it should have been pardoned for the sake of the beautiful Rhime, *clamantem* and *rogantem*, (not *petentem*, \*) as you have made it. There is nothing, I'm sure, that both *Pontanus* and *Erythraeus* are more taken with than such *Assonancies* of *Participles* in *Virgil*, whereof, among several others, they bring us these Examples:

*Atque hic undantem bello, magnumque fluentem.*

*Ora exsertantem, & naves in saxa trahentem.*

*Talibus orantem dictis, arasque tenentem.*

*Vincla-recusantum, & sera sub nocte rudentum.*

*Tum caput orantis nequicquam, & multa parantis.*

*Tum Bitiam ardentem oculis, animisque frementem.*

*Aeneam fundantem arces, ac tecta novantem.*

One Egg is not liker another than that Verse of *Buchanan* is to those of *Virgil*. But why the latter should appear so beautiful, and the former so monstrously ugly, is a Mystery to me, and, I believe, to every body else, utterly inexplicable.

You next proceed to *Pf. 5th*, on which you bring in a long Rhapsody concerning your *Alliterations*, *Assonancies* of *Syllables* and *Rhimings*, and would again perswade us, that in the kind of Verse employ'd in this Psalm, which

19

---

\* 'Tis true this you have amended in your *Errata*.

is the three *Sapphicks* with the *Adonick*, *Johnston* has the Advantage over *Buchanan*, in comparing it with the second *Stanza* of the 119th *Psalms*, which *Johnston* has rendered, in that kind of Verse. I have said so much on these *Alliterations*, &c. already, that it will be sufficient for me here to glance as briefly as I can at such Things, wherein you now more particularly strike at *Buchanan's* Honour.

In that 5th *Psalms* then, comparing it first with *Horace's Integer vite*, &c. you own, p. 25. that *Buchanan's* 2d Line,

*Mitis exaudi mea verba, mentis.*

"By the *a's* being properly plac'd, tho' iterated but three times, and the double initial Alliteration in *mitis-me*, is so very graceful, that to your Ear, you say, this Line is more musical than *Horace's*

*Non eget Mauri jaculis, nec arcu.*"

I am glad that for once *Buchanan* pleases you; but that Praise is soon lost, by the Offence given to your Ears in the 1st and 3d Lines. In the former,

*O potens rerum, Deus, aure leni,*

you confess indeed that you are much pleas'd, "that the soft Vowel *E* is alliterated five times, that four of them are full Sounds, *re-de-re-le-*, and that the three last are brought so near to one another, as to strike the Ear in a very pleasing Manner." But then you add, "How comes it then to pass that the whole Line together falls so very short of

*Integer vite scelerisque purus.*

The Reason, you say, is, the *O-po-* begins with too high a Note, and the heavy Syllable *tens*, and the rough Syllable *rum*, make a shocking Discord." But, I may be allowed to babble on these Things, the *O-potens rerum* is, in my Opinion, as harmonious as the rest. For 1st, I own indeed that the Letter *O*, especially as twice repeated, makes the Note high, that being, as *Scaliger*, *Poet. lib. iv. cap. 47.* calls it *Litera grandisona*. *Bergerus* says further of it, *de nat. pulchrit. orat. p. 271.* *sicut aliqua ex parte magnificum, sic vastum edit sonum, asertim cum mora prolatum.* What then more proper for

for a Person in great Distress, to begin his Invocation of Almighty God with Words of a high Note? And what more proper for that, than the Vowel *O* doubled? For this Reason, I believe, it is, that in most Languages, all Addresses to the supreme Being commonly begin with that Exclamation. What renders it yet more peculiarly fit in this Place is, that the *Orig.* bears, *Give ear, consider, hearken*; and the Prayer itself is called a *Cry*: And nothing sure more expressive of that Sense than the Use of that high sounding Letter. Of this we have a manifest Example in that Verse of *Virgil* quoted above, in which *Venus*, in a deep Concern for the Slaughter made by *Turnus* and his *Rutulians* upon the *Trojans*, addresses *Jupiter* thus,

*O pater, O hominum Divûmque aeterna potestas!*  
*(Namque aliud quid sit, quod jam implorare queamus?)*  
*Cernis ut insultent Rutuli? Turnusque feratur*  
*Per medios insignis equis, tumidusque secundo*  
*Marte ruat? ———*

You call the first of *these* one of *Virgil's* most sublime & sonorous Verses. And what is it that makes it so sonorous, as its beginning with *O pater, O hominum*? And is not *O-bo* of as high a Note as *O-po*; and *O-pa* next to it, the Letter *A* being, as *Scaliger* observes, *loc. cit.* likewise *litera grandisfona, i. e.* of a broad and elevated Sound. You see then what you have gain'd by this Remark.

As to what you write of the *tens*, and the *rum*, calling the one a heavy, and the other a rough Syllable; I cannot agree with you in either. The two Consonants in the former make it be pronounced slow, and thereby become more grave and solemn, which is very proper in all Invocations: But that is very different from its being heavy; for that I take to be the same thing as dull and sluggish. As to the other Syllable *rum*, tho' the *R* is generally a rough Letter, yet I do not think it so here: For as the above named *Scaliger*, p. 524. observes; *Sunt*, says he, *vo- ces mollissimæ per eam literam demonstratæ. Quid enim lenius risu? quid æquabilius ratione? quid minus aspernandum quàm res?* But whatever Asperity there may be in that Letter, it is taken off here by the two following,

U and



*U* and *M*, the last of which is a Letter of a strong and full Sound. But what are such Quibblings good for? For if your Remark were just, it would follow that the Words *potens* and *rerum* were unfit to be used by any good Poet; when yet, on the contrary, it is certain, that with them few Words are more frequent.

What you add of the 3d Line,

*Mente non durâ tetricusque tristes,*

is altogether intolerable. For you tell us, *p. 25*. "That the *ra-tri-trist*, being brought so near together, as perfectly sets the Readers Ears on Edge (if you may be allowed the Expression) as the sowrest Crab can his Teeth. This is even worse than *Adhibe hæc & absque*; which one would have thought impossible. Here we now see what it is to want Art." What Patience can bear this? That this Verse of *Buchanan* is so bad, that it is hardly possible that one could be worse; and that from it we now see that the Man really had no Art! What Person that had any Regard to his own Reputation, or that was not obstinately resolv'd to bid Defiance to the universal Consent of all the learned Part of Mankind, would talk at this rate. I have as carefully as I could considered this Verse, and, to my Apprehension, what you blame as a Deformity in it, is to me a great Beauty. The *ra-tri-trist* sound indeed rough, and it is proper they should; for the *durâ* and *tetricus* are design'd to represent one of a *stiff, rugged* or *inexorable* Temper. But then the Psalmist *David* is praying that God may not prove such to him. He had met with as many and as grievous Afflictions as most Men; which God not thinking fit altogether to remove, he might seem to deal *hardly* and *severely* by him. So that *David's* Prayer, as express'd by *Buchanan*, amounts just to this, *O my God, be not hard, rigid, or severe to me*. And if *durus* and *tetricus* are proper to express such a Disposition, where is the Fault of them? But because *Buchanan* (forsooth) wants Art, you will needs be so charitable as to instruct him, by altering the Stanza thus,

*Ætheris Rector, Deus, aure leni  
Mitis exaudi mea verba, mentis*

N

*Mente*

*Mente pacatâ, placidoque vultu  
Percipe questus.*

May I not here retort upon you, that *Rector* sounds rough by the two r's in it, with as good Reason as you do in *rum* or *retum*; though there is no Ground for either? And that the Phrase, *Ætheris Rector* is borrowed from *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, and by them probably from some Heathenish Author, which you upon other Occasions will not allow to be done? As to your third Line, I think it not only too soft and languid, but also somewhat improper. For *David* is not here praying for Pardon of his Sins, or that God would not be displeased or angry with him, which the Words *mente pacatâ* would import; but on the contrary he seems to appeal to God as conscious of his Innocence, and therefore with the greater Confidence he begs for Relief from the grievous Troubles he was then under. See Dr. *Patrick* on the Place.

After you have sported yourself (as I may call it) with your *Alliterations*, &c. in *Johnston's Sapphick* Version of the 2d Portion of the cxix. Psalm, you again fall foul upon *Buchanan's* 2d Strophe of the above Ps. v.

*Adspice attentus mihi quanta tendat  
Vox latus, quando mihi Rex Deusque  
Solus es, solum veneror precorque  
Rebus in artibus.*

where, with your wonted Justice, you tell us, " That he that can find any thing like *Horace's* Verse in these Lines, may discover it in one of his Majesty's Proclamations." As to the Harmoniousness of the Numbers in these Lines (which is the chief, if not the only thing to be considered in the Comparison) I see not what possibly should render them so unlike those of *Horace*. Nay I desire you to produce any modern ones that come nearer them. But it is not, it seems, in the Numbers only, but also in the Obscurity of the Sense, that they are so unlike *Horace's* Verses; for you immediately say, " As to the Sense, the Words, *Adspice attentus mihi quanta tendat* " *Vox latus*, should express, *Hearken unto the Voice of my Cry*: But what *Buchanan* meant by them, I should never have comprehended, had not a learned Commen-

" tator

"tator explained his Author in this Manner." And then you go on to give us *Tule's Latin Ecphrasis* of the Words, with your *English* Translation of it: After which you add by way of Triumph, "How poetically this is turned, and how delicately express'd in the Original! This it is to have the Advantage of Variety of Numbers, that the Poet may fully display his Thought, when he is not cramp'd by one Sort of Verse!" I am not a little surprized that you, who take upon you to dictate to all the World, and to shew them that they were all mistaken in their Notions concerning *Buchanan's* Poetry, should find it difficult to understand a very plain Passage in that Author, whose peculiar Property it is in all his Writings to be remarkably *clear* and *perspicuous*. One would have thought at least, that had the Sense of it been somewhat obscure, the very Original, *Hearken unto the Voice of my Cry*, would have been sufficient to have clear'd it up, without the Help of a Commentator. *Adspice attentus, &c.* i. e. *Behold attentively how great [or strong] a Voice stretches out, or heaves up my Sides:* And what else is that but, *Behold how vehemently I cry?* Can one cry without *heaving* up his *Sides* or *Breast*? I believe not. And may not that be poetically express'd by a *Vox adeo magna ut tendat mihi latus*.

What you add concerning the Variety of *Buchanan's* Numbers, has been thoroughly canvass'd already. But why he should be less cramp'd by that Variety, than he would have been by using one Sort of Verse, I see no Reason, but much the contrary. Had he done his *Psalms* in *Pindaricks* (which yet are extremely difficult on another Account) and much more, in the *Dramatick* Way, where the Poet is indulg'd much Liberty to change the Kind of Verse, and to make it long or short as he pleas'd, something of this might be alledged. But it is quite otherwise with *Buchanan*; for whatever Sort of Verse he began a *Psalms* with, he was oblig'd to go through with to the End, and every where tied down to observe all its Laws. And though in some of them perhaps he was more cramp'd than in others, yet I am perswaded (as I said before) that none of them would have proved more easy



to him than the *Elegiack*. Nay to bring the Matter closer home, of all the *Lyrick*, and I may add, of any other kind of *Metre*, I know none so difficult as the *Sapphick*, which he has chosen for this Psalm; it being allowed to most other Kinds, either interchangeably to mix their Feet, or to substitute one in place of another: Whereas in the *Sapphick*, every Foot is fixed to its proper Station, and none other can be admitted in its Room. This Rule is so strictly observed by our Author, that he has only once swerved from it in all this Work, *viz.* in that Line of *Pf. xc.* *Mox humi comis jacet arefactis.*

where the 2d Foot is a *Trochee*, instead of a *Spondee*. But enough of this.

Let us now hear, with you, *Johnston in his common Way*,  
*Annue quæsitis, Deus & Rex, perpete voto*  
*Tu mihi præ cunctis sollicitandus eris.*

I have nothing to quarrel in these Lines as to the Versification; but, with all Deference to better Judgments, I think they come very much short both of the *Original* and *Buchanan*. *Annue quæsitis*: Does this come up to the *Voice of my Cry*? or set forth the strong Vehemency and Earnestness of the Petitioner, which that implies. *Deus* and *Rex* are said too indefinitely, and the emphatical Repetition of the Word *my*, both to *King* and *God*, [*My King and my God*] is lost; which is preserved in *Buchanan* by *mibi* and *solus*, and then *solum*. I might add, that *Deus* is put before *Rex*, which you would in *Buchanan* have called an *Anticlimax*. The *perpete* is not a proper Epithet to *voto* here; for the Psalmist is not speaking of a continued State of Praying, but of that *Prayer* he is just now offering to God. *Præ cunctis* is not strong enough, for it does not sufficiently exclude the Worship of all other Gods; no more than that of *Virgil*, *Æn. iv. 5. Junoni ante omnes*, excludes *Ceres*, *Apollo* and *Bacchus*, named before. Lastly, the *sollicitandus eris*, (which are both Futures) respect too much a somewhat remote Time to come. 'Tis true, the *Orig.* has, *Unto thee will I make my Prayer*: But I take that to be the same as if he had said, *Unto thee I address the Prayer I am now offering*, or, as

Dr.

Dr. Patrick, in the present Tense, expresses it, *Unto thee I appeal as my sovereign Lord and supreme Judge*. You see that I, when put to it, can likewise play the Critick in my Turn; but whether of us has the best Talent that Way, let others determine.

Your next Touch is at our Author's third Stanza, where you say of,

*Nam tuum castâ prece non inanem  
Spem fovens, &c.*

"Can this be look'd upon as *Lyrick Poetry*, any where "on this Side the *Cape of Good Hope*?" It seems on the other Side of that *Cape*, it may pass. But why carry it so far? When the *Hottentots* and other barbarous Nations that live at some nearer Distance, shall be taught to understand the Language, I know nothing will make them be displeased with it, if your Book is kept out of their Hands. But, to be serious, why do you not, as at other times, point out where its Deformity lies? For I own to you, till that is done, I am so dull, that I cannot perceive any better Lines in all this Author's Work than these.

But this Omission of yours is somewhat repaired in your following Remark, where after you have told us, "that the first Line of the 4th Stanza,

*Tu Deus, laus pietate verâ,*

"(in which the *e* is iterated five times) is as soft and as musical as is possible;" you immediately subjoin, "But then it is followed by one almost as disagreeable as this is pleasing,

*Impii ritûs scelus execraris.*

"The *impii-ri-* at the Beginning of this Line makes the Ear suffer more than a little, and the *execraris* at the End of it is really *execrable*, for more Reasons than one." 'Tis strange that *Buchanan*, who you say wanted Art, should yet in this Psalm stumble on two Lines, the former of which is more musical than some of *Horace*, and the latter as musical as possible; and it is no less strange, that the very Line next following after both should be stark naught and intolerable. But what pray is it in this last (for of the former I have spoke already) that

makes it so very offensive to the Ear, and *execrable*? I protest, I cannot discover where the Fault lies, unless it is in the Signification of the Words *impii* and *exsecraris*, which indeed have bad *Ideas* imply'd in them. But must we not have Words for bad things as well as good? Because *impious*, *cruel*, *barbarous*, *accursed*, *brutal*, *execrable*, and innumerable such like, convey to the Mind Representations of what is *evil*, must we not, when we have occasion for them, make use of them? Are we allowed to have them in our Thoughts, and yet not dare to express them in Words? And if so, why have you adventured to give so many ill Names to *Buchanan's* Verses, by calling them *wretched*, *shocking*, *distorted*, *hobbling*, and here *execrable*, &c. none of which give us agreeable *Ideas*? Are we obliged, as the *Heathen* at the Solemnities of their Idol-worship, *malè ominatis parcere verbis*; and not permitted to call things by the Names appropriated to them, as is done here and every where else in the *Orig.* itself? But, as such a Notion as this, is so obviously absurd, that I cannot think that you or any Man in his right Wits can possibly entertain it, you must certainly have some other Meaning in your Words, and what that is I am still to seek. However, to grope in the Dark, I shall suppose it to be in one of these three Things. 1<sup>st</sup>, That your *Alliterations* or *Assonancies*, &c. are wanting. But, besides that I hope you do not require these in every Line, we have here an Alliteration of the Letter *I* in *pi-i-ri*, and the Syllables *ius* and *lus* clinking with one another. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That the Words in general are not poetical. But neither can that be maintain'd; for few Words are more common than *impius* and *ritus* in the best Poets: And has not *Virgil* *exsecramur* and *exsecrantur*, and *Horace* *exsecrata*. 3<sup>dly</sup>, *Impii ritus* should not with Poets be join'd so close together, or be put in the Genitive singular, nor *exsecraris* be used in the second Person. But these are such idle, and I may say ridiculous Pretences, that they do not deserve any Answer. These are all the Reasons I can think of, why you pass so hard a Censure upon these Words in *Buchanan*. If you have any other, and more feasible, you may give us them in your next Edition;



Edition; for in this (to me at least) they are incomprehensible.

But here you leave off criticising *Buchanan's Lyrics*: And it is good for him that you do so; for, as you tell us afterwards, p. 40. "That if you was to compare every Verse from one End to the other of all the Psalms, you could shew the Emptiness of them in all Respects when compared with *Johnston*." He is certainly much obliged to you, for not exposing him so far as you might have done.

---

### C H A P. III.

**B**UCHANAN's Trial however is not over; for you have still reserved three *Psalms* of his, as also his *Dedication*, which you are to bring under a more particular and more rigorous Examination than any other, viz. the 137th in this your *Supplement*, and the 1st and 104th, and *Dedication*, in what you call your *Conclusion*. And this brings me to the *third* and *last* Part of my Undertaking, which was to shew that the critical Remarks you make upon *Buchanan's* Paraphrase of these three *Psalms*, and upon his *Dedication*, have very small or no Foundation; and that upon comparing these, Verse by Verse, with the same *Psalms* as done by Dr. *Johnston*, and his *Dedication*, *Buchanan* has, notwithstanding all you have said to the contrary, very much the Superiority.

## S E C T. I.

**Buchanan and Johnston's 137th Psalm compared.**

What you have to say against 137th *Psalm*, you usher in with telling your Readers, p. 31. "That you will now compare our two Poets as to their Abilities in *Elegiack* Numbers: And here, *you say*, that *Buchanan's* Admirers may see you are willing to do him Justice, you have taken the finest of all his Performances this way; indeed, in the Opinion of most of his Readers, the finest Piece of the whole Book." This is done like a Man of true Bravery, who think it below you to attack your Enemy at a Disadvantage, and where he is weakest; but you choose rather to make your Onset in that Part where his main Strength lies. 'Tis true, this 137th *Psalm* is very much and very justly admired as a fine Piece, by most, if not all its Readers: But I know none of them who think it the finest of the whole Book; for the 104th has, in the Opinion of all, been prefer'd before it. But be that as it will, you add, that "However, you are apt to think, when it comes to be weigh'd against *Johnston's*, *Buchanan's* Scale will kick the Beam." This quaint Phrase of *kicking the Beam* is not a little discouraging: For who will venture on a Combat, where the Odds on the other Side are like to be so great? But these are only big Words, which none but Cowards will be affrighted with: For, not to be behind with you in boasting, I am hopeful that, notwithstanding all this vapouring, and the many empty Cavils you have cast in, to add what you think some Weight to *Johnston's* Scale, I shall make it appear that *Buchanan's* Scale does still preponderate. To begin then with *Buchanan's* three first Couplets of that *Psalm*,

(1) *Dum procul à patria mæsti Babylonis in oris  
Fluminis ad liquidas forte sedemus aquas, &c.*

1. Your first Objection is, "that the Word *forte* is a  
" mere

“ mere Expletive, and very much weakens the Sense. “ *By Chance we sat down by the River's Side.*” Why? and was it not really a *Chance*? Or did those poor *Jews* before-hand form a *Design*, and fix upon a certain *Day* on which they were to sit down on the Banks of the *Euphrates*? And did they resolve at that precise time, to lay by their Harps and fall a weeping? And did they then certainly foreknow, that the proud *Babylonians* would desire them to entertain them with their Country's Music? If we suppose this to have been the Case, then indeed there was no *Chance* in it. But he that will suppose this, must at the same time deny that there is any thing like *Chance* in the World \*, and of consequence that *Virgil* was very much out, when, on an Occasion something parallel to this, he says,

*Forte sub arguta confederat ilice Daphnis.*

This Remark then of yours is itself a mere *Expletive*; that is, must stand here, like other idle Expletives, for just nothing.

2. Your following Remark is never a whit better. In it you tell us, “ that the next Couplet is an *Anticlimax*,” and as such you rail at it for a long way,

—— *species miseranda Sionis,*

*Et nunquam patrii tecta videnda soli.*

But where lies the *Anticlimax*? Why? In this, to mention first *Sion*, and then their *native Dwellings*. *This*, you say, is perfectly ridiculous. That their Temple's being destroy'd would give them the greatest Grief, I shall easily acknowledge; but were they to think of nothing else? Was it not natural, nay unavoidable in them, to remember also with deep Sorrow, that *Jerusalem* was laid on Heaps, and that they had no Hopes of ever seeing it again. Is not *Jerusalem* twice named afterwards in this Psalm, as that which gave a most bitter Accent to their Lamentations, as it did at the same time to the mournful Prophet

---

\* I am here using the Word in the common Acceptation of it among Men, being at the same time sensible that, with respect to the Great GOD, there is nothing that can be call'd *casual* in human Affairs, the most minute Circumstances of them being all directed and over-ruled by his almighty Power and Providence.



Prophet *Jeremiah*? But *Jerusalem* is mentioned after Mount *Zion*, or the *Temple*. There lies the great Fault †. One would readily think the very contrary. For is it not most natural, that what lies uppermost in the Heart should come first out at the Mouth, and that what we most value should have the first Place? If otherwise, it is a Fault to say, *The Love of God*, and *the Love of our Neighbour*; *Fear God*, *honour the King*; *The King of Britain*, and *Duke of Brunswick*, &c. At this rate, our Words must be ranged in Discourse, as Persons are in publick Processions, where the most honourable generally come last. *Horace* was then in the wrong, when, tho' he begins with *Quem virum aut heroa*——*Quem Deum*, ascending from the lower to the higher, yet immediately he inverts the Order, by naming first *Jupiter*, then *Pallas*, then *Demi-gods* and *Heroes*, and last of all ordinary Men. As on the contrary, if your *Anticlimaxes* are so ridiculous, as you represent them, we should laugh at *Pindar*, as well as *Buchanan*, for he in that Place, from which (as *Scaliger*, *Poet. lib. v. cap. 7.* observes) *Horace* has borrowed his above Words, has chosen to descend from the greater to the lesser, thus,

Ἀναξίφ' ῥιμίσγες ὕμνοι,  
Τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα,  
Τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδῆσομεν.

But neither in these Examples, nor in *Buchanan*, is there any thing like an *Anticlimax*. The Figure, to which you have given that modern Name, formerly called *hysteron proteron*, or *hysterologia*, is of a very different Nature, viz. when two things are said in a Sentence, and

† If this is, as you represent it, so faulty and perfectly ridiculous in *Buchanan*, then *Asaph*, who pen'd the 79th Psalm, much about the same Time, and on the same Occasion, with this 137th, was (which is impious to assert) no less faulty and ridiculous as he. For that Divine Author has fallen into the same fancied *Anticlimax*; by saying, *Ver. 1.* O God, the Heathen are come into thine Inheritance, thy holy Temple have they defiled: they have laid Jerusalem on Heaps. And *Ver. 7.* They have devoured Jacob, and laid waste his Dwelling-place; almost in the same Words with that of *Jeremiah*, x. 25. They have eaten up Jacob, and made his Habitation desolate. Which agree very much with the *testa patrii soli* in *Buchanan*.

and that which is plac'd first necessarily supposes that which follows to have been before it, as in that of *Virgil* *Æneid* iii. 652.

*Postquam altos tetigit fluctus, & ad æquora venit; \**  
or, as (whether Dr. *Swift* or Mr. *Pope* be the Author of it) in the Treatise, *περὶ Βαδούς*, or *Art of sinking in Poetry*, it is described, when the second Line drops quite short of, or falls vastly below the first; and the two foolish Lines you mention are brought for an Example;

*And thou Dalhousie, the great God of War,*

*Lieutenant Colonel to the Earl of Mar †;*

to which that of *Buchanan* has not the least Resemblance.

3. Tho' in the first Couplet of this Psalm, you give up the Objection made by Dr. *Trapp* to *liquidas aquas*; for you own that *liquidas* certainly means *CLEAR*, contrary to what he had advanced of its being an idle Epithet. But you agree with him as to the other of the *liquida aqua* its being repeated again in the same Verse. And the same Fault you find with *patria* in the first Couplet, and *patrii soli* in the next. As to these Repetitions of the same Words, I shall pass them over here, being to consider them more fully afterwards. I only remark, that both you and Dr. *Trapp* are mistaken, when you say, that *liquida aqua* is again repeated in the same Verse; and *he, trium versiculorum spatio*: unless you, by the same Verse, mean the whole Psalm; and *he*, by three Versicles, means the Space of three Couplets. But who is there that speaks so, unless it be to impose on the unwary Reader? for the

---

\* This Figure (which you say is perfectly ridiculous) is to be found in other Places of that great Poet; nay, with *Homer* himself, it is very frequent. On which Account, *Cicero*, in an Epistle to *Atticus* (i. 16.) when he was to put that first, which naturally ought to be last, says, *Respondere tibi, ὕστερον πρότερον, Οὐ μνησκῶς*. But here in *Buchanan* (as I said) there is not the least shadow of any such Figure.

† These two Lines (for which we are refer'd to an Anonymous Author) seem probably to have been composed by the Author of the *περὶ Βαδούς* himself, by way of Example, of what he is there describing. I am sure they were not composed in the Year 1715, upon the Pretender's landing in Scotland, (as Mr. *Benson* affirms) for the then Earl of *Dalhousie* was not engaged on either Side, far less was he Lieutenant Colonel to the Earl of *Mar*,

the *liquida aque* is in the 2d Line, and not repeated till the 6th.

4. That nothing may escape you, you come next to the Verfication of these three Couplets, and "that, " *you tell us*, may be said to be perfectly inverted; for instead of two of them being out of the common Pause, " and one in it, we see quite the Reverse. In these six " Lines there is but one Place out of the vulgar *Cesure*, " and that is at *Flevimus*." I have said so much of these Pauses above, that I need to say no more of them here, than only to observe, 1<sup>st</sup>, That it is not true, that the one Example you bring here from *Buchanan*, viz. at *Flevimus*, and the two you mention below in *Johnston*, are out of the common Pause: For all the three retain the common Pause at the *Penthemimeres* or Syllable after the second Foot, and are not turned out of it by your superadding other Pauses before or after it, in the same Line. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That your Pauses are here entirely directed by the Punctations or Sense; whereas I have shew'd above, that in Verfication, that is, in the Metre, or Verse, CONSIDERED AS VERSE, these Pauses are no otherwise concern'd than as there is a Syllable remaining after a Foot; which is therefore call'd a *Cesure*, because it is in the Measures cut off from the rest of the Word. 3<sup>dly</sup>, And which I much wonder at, you here, and often elsewhere, give it the Name of *Cesure*, when yet in the two Examples you bring of *Flevimus* in *Buchanan*'s 5th Line and *Johnston*'s 2d Line, you could not but know that the *Dactyle*, which is the first Foot in both, takes up the whole Word, without any *Cesure* at all remaining. 4<sup>thly</sup>, Which I was not aware of, nor expecting, you bring in the Pause at *Flevimus* in *Johnston*'s Pentameter Line; whereas I supposed that the *Pauses* or *Cesures* you are so much concern'd about, were all confined to *Hexameter heroick* Lines only. But 5<sup>thly</sup>, How come you to say, that that *Pentameter* of *Johnston* is out of the common Pause at *Flevimus*, when whatever Pause you put at *Flevimus*, common or uncommon, there must be a *common* one at the *Penthemimeres* or after 2d Foot? it being  
reckon-



reckoned the greatest of all Faults in *Pentameters* to want that *Cæsura*; as in that mentioned by *Diomedes*,

*Hæc quoque nostræ sententia mentis erat:*

And it sounds very harsh, when the Syllable following after it is swallowed up by an *Elision*, as in that of *Catullus*,

lxxvi. 4. *Mi misero eripuisti omnia nostra bona*, and in some few Places more of that otherwise excellent Poet. But after his Time I know of no Poet, especially in the *Augustan* Age, that ever used that Liberty; *Tibullus*, *Propertius* and *Ovid* always closing the first Hemistich of the *Pentameter* with the *Penthemimeres* or common *Cæsura*, and that without any *Elision* in that Place.

5. When you come more particularly to compare *Johnston's* Version with *Buchanan's*, you tell us, 1st, That the one has but four Lines, whereas the other has six: Which is no more, but that *Buchanan's* Paraphrase is more free and full than that of *Johnston*. But whether of the two should have the Preference in that respect, I have given my Opinion already, p. 135.

Next, you say, "How different is *fusi Babylonis ad undas*, from *ad liquidas forte sedemus aquas*? *Fusi* presents them as People in Captivity, scattered about; and in this deplorable Condition they wept, and their Tears were like the River upon whose Borders they were dispersed." That the Word *fusi* alone signifies People scattered about, I shall grant you. But I never yet saw it taken for Persons in Captivity: For when an Army of Men is routed and put to flight, *fusi fugatique*, as the Phrase is, they are for that very Reason supposed not to be made Captives, and that it was to avoid Captivity or Death that they betook themselves to flight. But the Truth is, that *fusi*, as join'd with *ad undas* in this Place, can be taken in neither of these Senses. For in such Phrases as these, *Fusique per herbam*, *Fusi per mœnia Teucris*, in *Virgil*, and the like, Persons are supposed to be in a State of *Tranquillity* and *Peace*. So that what you cry up here as a great Beauty in *Johnston*, is to me a real Impropriety. I might add, that he has not clearly express'd the *Posture of Sitting* in the Original: *By the Rivers*

*Rivers of Babylon, there we SAT down*, (which *Buchanan* has taken care to do) *fusi* rather signifying a negligent Posture of lying or lolling at Ease, than *sitting*. Besides, I observe, that *sitting* is oftentimes taken for a Posture of one in great Grief or Melancholy, as in that of *Virgil*, where, of the Shepherd that was at his Wits end, how to cure the Murrain in his Sheep, it is said, *Geo. iii. 456.*

— *Et meliora Deos SEDET omina poscens*; where, in my Opinion, *sedet* is wrong rendred by *Ruans, otatur*. And so *Æn. vi. 617.*

— *Sedet æternumque sedebit*

*Infelix Theseus.* —

Again, you tell us, “ that *Johnston* mentions sacred *Sion* as the only thing that presented itself to their Imagination, but not a Word about *their Houses in their native Country*.” As if it was a great Fault to mention that, which they could not possibly avoid thinking of, as well as of *Sion*, and which we are told thrice in *Ver. 5th* and *6th*, they did actually and in a particular manner think of: *If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, if I do not remember thee — If I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief Joy.* You quarrel’d this before. as being an *Anticlimax*, in that *Jerusalem*, or their *native Dwellings*, are named after *Sion* or the *Temple*; whereas, according to you, *Jerusalem* should have been named first, and the *Temple*, whose Destruction affected them most, have been reserved to the second Place. The Absurdity of which Conceit I have sufficiently expos’d above. But here you go farther, and blame our Author for naming *Jerusalem* at all. “ It is, say you, *SACRED SION* that dwells “ eternally on their Minds, and not a Word (you should “ have added *Thought*) about *their Houses in their native Country*.” Whereas (as I said) it appears in the Sequel of the Psalm, that their *Houses*, or *Jerusalem*, is not only thought, but again and again spoken of by them. Had you said only, that there is nothing of *Jerusalem* in this Place in the Text, I should readily have own’d it. But then if such *Additions* are not allowed, what will become of the like made by *Johnston* in this very Psalm, such as, — *servili non temeranda manu.* — *nunc taciturna* —

*turna—Tectaque montanis mox habitanda feris?* \* For most of which there was less occasion than for that of Buchanan: Not to mention smaller things, as *fluminis instar,—sidere tacta—quibus astra laceffis Culmina, &c.* Not that I blame such Additions, as being sensible that without them there can be no Paraphrase. But that which in a particular manner ought to silence you on this Head is, that *Johnston* makes these *Jews* begin with mentioning *Jerusalem, Urbe procul Solymæ*, which is the same with Buchanan's *Dum procul à patria*, tho' there is nothing for either of them in the *Orig.*

(2.) Having clear'd Buchanan's three first Couplets of this Psalm, let us go to the fourth,

*Muta super virides pendebant nabilia ramos,*

*Et salices tacitas sustinuerunt lyras;*

of which you say, "that you have already animadverted upon the Heaviness of this Translation." The Animadversion you refer to is in *Supplem. p. 8.* where you speak nothing of its being heavy, but only complain of the Repetition of *muta nabilia* and *tacitas lyras*: To which I also have returned Answer, and shall only add, that if Repetitions of the same Thoughts in other Words render a Passage heavy or dull, then some of what were thought the brightest and most animated, in ancient Authors, must on that very Account be excessively so. I shall instance two from the two greatest of them, one in *Prose* from *Cicero pro Milone, cap. 4. Est enim hæc non scripta, sed nata lex; quam non didicimus, accepimus, legimus; verum ex natura ipsa arripimus, hausimus, expressimus; ad quam,*

NON

\* I cannot here omit observing your gross Inconsiderateness, in accusing Buchanan of an *Antichmax*, which *Johnston* is as guilty of as he; for in this place *Johnston* names the Temple first, *Vertite, clamabant, fundam. jam vertite templum*, and then their Dwellings or City *Jerusalem, Tecta- que montanis &c.* for, by *tecta*, I see not what else is to be meant. May, perhaps it was not fit in *Johnston* to name here the Temple at all; but it is not mentioned in the *Orig.* which has only, *Remember, O Lord, the Children of Edom, in the Day of Jerusalem, who said, Raze it, raze it. i. e. Jerusalem, even to the Foundation thereof.* And to Buchanan, *Orbite, ex imis evertite fundamentis, Aquaque, clamabant, reddite tecta: solo.* From this one Instance, (tho' we had no more) we may clearly see that Justice Buchanan is to expect at your Hands,



*non docti, sed facti; non instituti, sed imbuti sumus, &c.*  
The other from *Virgil*, *Geo. iv. 511.*

*Qualis populea mærens Philomela sub umbra,  
Amisfos queritur fœtus, quos durus arator  
Observans nido implumes detraxit; at illa  
Flet noctem, ramoque sedens miserabile carmen  
Integrat, & mæstis latè loca questibus implet.*

In the former, the Repetitions are no less frequent than remarkable; in the latter, besides the *queritur, flet, integrat miserabile carmen*, and *implet loca questibus*, all much to the same Purpose; we have almost the same Words repeated, *mærens* and *mæstis*, *queritur* and *questibus*. And yet, in both, these Repetitions are so far from depressing or burdening the Sentiments, that they, on the contrary, raise and enliven them to the highest Degree.

Of the excessive Commendations you have given to *Johnston's* — *servili non temeranda manu*, I will probably have occasion to speak afterwards.

As to what you say of the *Versification*, “that *BUCHANAN's* is as bad as can be; and *Johnston's* as perfect as can be desired:” Till you condescend upon Particulars, I must look upon as Words thrown out at random. To me the *Versification* in both seems very good; but if there is any Odds, I think *Buchanan* has it, and so should you too, for the sake of your beloved *Alliterations* In the *Pentameter Line*, *sa-ta*, and *tas-ras*, and *li-ci-si-ly-*; as also what you call the *plain direct Rhime*, or the *Crambe* or *Clinking* of the two *Hemistichs*, *tacitas* — *lyrai*. *Johnston's* *Pentameter* wants this last; and the former are not so many, nor so remarkable in it, as in *Buchanan's*.

(3.) You come next to compare the three following Couplets of *Buchanan* with two of *Johnston*,

*Ecce ferox dominus, &c. And,  
Qui patriâ exegit, &c.*

where you find every thing perfect in the latter, but stark naught in the former. Well, let us see then how you make it out.

Your first Exception to *Buchanan's* Version in these three Couplets is, “that the Sense is too diffused through-  
“ out, but especially at the Conclusion, *finitimis in-*  
“ *dis-*”

"*diſoſa locis*. This, you ſay, has nothing in the World  
 "to do with the *Original*, and is brought in merely to  
 "make up the Verſe, being taken from *Ovid's* Epistles,  
 "*Dido to Æneas*." To *Buchanan's* Diffuſedneſs, as  
 you call it, we have in general ſpoke already. That the  
 Words *finitimis invidioſa locis* is an Addition to the Text,  
 I own; but that it *has nothing in the World to do with it*,  
 is equally falſe. Was there, pray, any thing more nat-  
 ural for theſe poor Captives, than, while they were re-  
 membring how their Harps were employ'd in the Praises  
 of God in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, to think alſo of the  
 Glories of the Place? There is no Compariſon betwixt  
 this and *Johnſton's* *ſervili non temeranda manu*, and *mon-*  
*tanis mox habitanda feris*: Which Additions, you ſay, ve-  
 ry much *heighten the Senſe*; but, ſay I, very little, if at  
 all: Whereas that of *Buchanan* does highly brighten and  
 illuſtrate it. Was not *Solomon's* Temple reckoned one  
 of the ſeven *Wonders* of the World? and perhaps the  
 greateſt of them all? Does not the *Pſalmiſt* in another  
 Place, *xlviii. 2.* call it (or Mount *Zion*) *the Joy of the*  
*whole Earth*? Is it not told, that *glorious things are ſaid*  
*of it*, *Pſ. lxxxvii. 3.* and that *Kings paſſed by and marvel-*  
*led to ſee it*, *xlviii. 4, 5*? And was not ſuch a Sight apt  
 to raiſe their Envy? Is it not uſual with Poets, to call  
 things that are great and magnificent, *invidioſa* and *invi-*  
*denda*; as, *invidioſa mœnia* in the above cited Place in *O-*  
*vid*, and *invidenda aula* in *Horace, Ode ii. 10*? And  
 would not the Remembrance of that glorious Edifice,  
 now deſtroy'd, cauſe them ſhed abundance of Tears,  
 when we are told that the *ancient Men* who ſaw it re-  
 built, and obſerv'd how far this ſecond came ſhort of that  
 firſt Temple, *wept with a loud Voice*, *Ezra iii. 12.*

If then theſe Words, *finitimis invidioſa locis* (which  
 ſignify no more, but that Mount *Zion*, or the Temple  
 was the Admiration of all the Heathen People around it)  
 are as pat to the Purpoſe as any thing can be well ima-  
 gined; of what Importance is it, that *Ovid* has uſed that  
 Phraſe before? Tho', by the by, *Ovid* has join'd it to  
*Mœnia*, and not *Regia*; which *Buchanan* thought more  
 proper, becauſe it was (as it were) the *City* or *Palace* of

the great King of the World, *Pf.* xlviii. 2. Is there any thing more common with Poets than to borrow from those that went before them? None more guilty of this (if it is a Fault, as in general I think it is none) than the great *Virgil* himself; all whose Poems are almost wholly made up of Verses, or Parts of Verses, taken from other Poets that lived in the preceeding Ages. *Macrobius*, who lived some Hundreds of Years after him, and consequently when many Authors were lost, which in *Virgil's* time were extant, yet has employed a good part of his *Saturnalia*, in shewing at great length what Passages *Virgil* has taken, first from the Greek Poets, especially *Homer*; and next from the Latin, *Furius*, *Lucilius*, *Pacuvius*, *Suevius*, *Nævius*, *Accius*, *Lucretius*, *Catullus*, and particularly from *Ennius*. See him, *Saturn. lib. v. cap. 3.* &c. to the End of that Book; and *lib. vi. cap. 1.* 2, 3. \* And *Scaliger*, in his *Poëtice*, *lib. iv. cap. 17.* says of that Prince of Poets, *Equidem arbitror P. Virgilium Maronem, antiquorum Poëtarum studiosissimum, ex eorum tragœdiis potissimum lectissima quæque, novum de suo nihil ad divinæ orationis splendorem attulisse.* And of *Horace*, says the same *Scaliger*, *lib. v. cap. 1.* *In Lyricis quot a Græcis suffuratus sit loca, haud facile dicere possumus, cum illa interiere. Exstant tamen haud pauca, quorum nonnulla suo loco recitabuntur.* And in *cap. 7.* where he is as good as his Word, he repeats it again: *De Horatio quidem*

---

\* See also *A. Gellius*, who mentions several Passages in *Virgil*, borrowed from ancient Greek Authors, *lib. ix. cap. 9.* xiii. 25. and xvii. 10. *Lambin*, in his Dedication of his Commentary on *Lucretius* to *Charles IX.* of France, likewise observes, that both *Virgil* and *Horace*, ex eo (i. e. *Lucretio*) non solum dimidiator, sed integros sepe versus mutuari solent. With respect to *Virgil*, *A. Gellius* had said the same in these Words, *lib. 1. cap. 21.* *Non verba autem sola, sed versus prope totos & locos quoque Lucretii plurimos sectatum esse Virgilium videmus.* See also *Jo. Nic. Funccius*, who in his Treatise, *de virili aetate Latina lingue*, *cap. iii. § 21.* mentions those Authors, both Greek and Latin, whom *Virgil* has been obliged to; and remarks, that *Valens Germanus Guellius's* *Commentationes & Paralipomena in Virgilium*, printed at *Antwerp 1575.* fol. are chiefly taken up in noting parallel Places to these of that Author from the Greeks; and that *Fulv. Ursinus* has written a Treatise to the same Purpose, intituled, *Virgilius cum Græcis scriptoribus collatus*, *Antw. 1682.* 8vo.



*quidem ita sentimus, si Græcorum Lyrica exstarent, futurum ut illius furta quamplurima deprehenderentur.* Among several which he brings of that kind, this Example is very remarkable, which is also taken notice of by others:

*Nullam, Vare, sacrâ vite prius severis arborem,*  
which is almost a literal Translation of that of *Alcæus*;

*Μηδ' ἐν ἄλλο φυτέουσιν πρότερον δένδρεον ἀμτέλω.*

And there is no Doubt, but that all the other Poets took in like manner the Benefit of those before them; and especially in borrowing both Thoughts, and the way of expressing them, from him who is reckoned the Father and Fountain of them all, I mean *Homer*; which made *Ovid* say,

*Adspice Mæoniden, à quo, cœu fonte perenni,  
Vatum Pieriis ora rigantur aquis.*

And in another Place, complaining of the want of Books, especially (as we may well suppose) those of the poetick kind;

*Non hic librorum per quos inviter alarque  
Copia.*

Nay, there are some who think that even *Homer* himself was not a little obliged to Poets that lived before his Time, which are long since lost.

It is therefore a most unjust Banter you pass upon *Buchanan*, when upon the occasion of his taking a Verse from *Ovid* with a small Alteration, you bawl out, "That this is the Nature of his whole Translation from the Beginning to the End." And then add "The very first Hemistich is a Scrap out of *Angelus Politianus*; then you have a Bit from *Virgil*, another from *Horace*; by and by from *Claudian*, *Statius*, *Martial*, and you do not know how many more: So that, upon the whole, this Royal Poet, by the Help of all this Patch-work, is dress'd up like a perfect *Harlequin*." Had *Buchanan* brought in these Verses (which you say he has stolen from others) impertinently, and, as we say, by *Head and Shoulders*, and tack'd them together, without due Propriety and Connexion, as the Custom of some mean Poets is, there might have been good Ground for this Complaint.

plaint. But in fact it is so far otherwise, that I give a Defiance to all the World, to produce me so much as one single Verse or Phrase, which he has taken from any Author before him, which is not so proper and natural for his Purppse, that tho' formerly used by another, yet it seems to be so entirely his own, that it does not deserve to be call'd a *Theft*. It is therefore no Disparagement to him, that he did what all the greatest Poets had done before him in their Turn. For it is true of such Imitations as these, when managed with Judgment and Discretion, as he has done, what is said of them by *Marius Corradus*, in his learned Book *de ling. Lat. lib. xiii. p. m. 479. Ut non furto ac per injuriam ab aliis surrepta, sed nostra ac nobiscum esse nata videantur* \*. I have already shew'd that, notwithstanding what you have said to the contrary, the Line borrowed from *Ovid* is of that kind; and since I am upon it, you must forgive that I mention other three like Examples.

The first is that in *Pf. iv.* taken from *Virgil*,

*O pater, O hominum divûmque æterna potestas;*  
the exquisite Propriety whereof I have shew'd already, as also the Emptiness of your Cavils against it, *p. 161.*

The second is the beginning and ending of the 8th *Pf.* from *Horace*,

*Gentis humanæ pater atque custos;*  
than which nothing could better express, *O Lord, our Lord*; or, as it is in the old Translation, *O Lord our Governor*, (where *our* is to be applied to the *Race of Mankind upon Earth*, as appears by the rest of the *Psalms*) and is incomparably better than *Johnston's Calicolum Rex*, i. e. *King of the heavenly Inhabitants*, which, tho' otherwise true, is not there intended.

A third is in the beginning of *Psal. lxxxii.* where two Lines are likewise borrowed from *Horace*, with a small Alteration of one Word;

*Regnum*

\* *A. Gellius, lib. ix. cap. 9.* above cited, tho' in some things he blames *Virgil*, yet in the main he commends his great Judgment in that respect, *Scire ergo*, says he, & considerate *Virgilius, quum om. Homeri, aut Hesiodi, aut Apollonii, aut Parthenii, aut Callimachi, aut Theocriti antiquarundam aliorum locos effingeret, partim reliquit, alia expressit.*

*Regum timendorum in proprios greges,*

*Reges in ipsos imperium est Jovæ;*

which is so pat for expressing, *God standeth in the Congregation of the mighty*, that hardly any thing can be more.

But these few Instances I bring by way of Ensamples, being satisfied that all the rest of that kind are fit and pertinent in their Places. And yet, upon the whole, I cannot enough admire, how you should have the Assurance to run down *Buchanan*, for this imitating of, or, if you will, borrowing from the Ancients, when you could not but know, that your favourite Author has taken as great, if not a greater Liberty that way than he, by borrowing from both ancient and modern Writers; and what is very remarkable, (tho' in your Notes you artfully dissemble it) he has taken more from *Ovid*, the Author you so much contemn, than from *Virgil*, *Horace*, and some others put together; and not a little from (as you represent him) the artless *Buchanan* himself. Of which I design to give you a pretty large List afterward.

2. You next fall a quibbling at single Words, by telling us, "That *ferox* and *opimæ* are mere Expletives; so "is *acerbo* in the 3d Line; and *canebamus* in the 5th, is a "strange Word in Poetry." If *ferox*, *opimæ* and *acerbo* are mere Expletives, then all Adjectives are so. I thought hitherto that such Adjectives or Epithets made up one of the greatest Beauties in Poetry, especially when, as here, they add a new Idea to the Substantive. Is every *Dominus*, *ferox*; or every City, *opima*? May we not as justly say, *ferox Dominus*, and *opima Solyme*, as *Horace* (who is incomparably happy in the Choice of his Epithets) does *ferox miles*, and *opima Larissa*. And tho' most *Exilia*, (not all, for some have prov'd otherwise) are hard to be born, yet they are not equally so; and very few, if any at all, have come up to be so *acerba*, as this, which, if we will believe the Prophet *Daniel*, was the most grievous that to that Time had ever happened: *Under the whole Heaven*, says he, *has not been done, as hath been done upon Jerusalem*, *Dan. ix. 12.* And *Jeremiah* expresses it by the very Word *bitter*, when in his Prophecies, *ii, 19. Know therefore*, says he, *and see, that it is an evil thing*



and BITTER, that thou hast forsaken the Lord thy God; i.e. "that your Idolatry and other Sins have brought this "most grievous and bitter Calamity upon you, the Destruction of your capital City, and the Captivity and Banishment of your whole Nation consequent thereupon." So that if the Word *Exilium* is capable of an Epithet, (and that it is, *Infelix exilium* in *Virgil* shews) it would puzzle you, or any other Person whatsoever, to find out one so apposite, as the *acerbum* is in this Place.

What you mean by saying, that *canebamus* is a strange Word in Poetry, I am somewhat at a loss to find out. The Word *cane* in general is a very poetical Word, *cannere* and *versus facere* being frequently used as promiscuous Terms. It must then be the Sound of the *bamus* in the first Person plural that gives the Offence. What an unaccountable Niceness is this? Are all Words in *bamus* excluded from Poetry? *Martial* (who was never blam'd for the Choice of his Words, or the Harmoniousness of his Numbers) uses the Word *scribebamus*, which I'm sure sounds as harsh as *canebamus*, *Epig. xii. 95. 1.*

*Scribebamus epos: cœpisti scribere, cessi,*

*Æmula ne starent carmina nostra tuis.*

and I doubt not but other such like may be found in good Poets. If there is Ground for quarrelling *Buchanan* on this Head, I hardly know any Author that can escape. For *desperabantur* and *præstiteratis* in the same *Martial*; *superuolitaverit*, *abstistamus*, *fatigamus*, *congregiamur*, in *Virgil*; *conviviorum*, *sollicitudine*, *convivatoris*, *gustaremus*, in *Horace*; *circumstaremus* in *Propertius*; and *combinans*, *nomenclaturis*, *ligurivit* in *Johnston*, are equally liable to Censure.

But the most hideous Outcry of all is that which you make about the Word *quale*. "This, you say, is a *nodus difficilis* to the Partisans of *Buchanan*. If this is not a plain Solecism, what can be one? The two Antecedents are *verba* and *carmina*, and if *quale*, should not have been *qualia*, it was to no Purpose that we were puzzled about *Lily* in our Infancy." I own that the way of speaking is unusual, and took notice of it as such in my few Notes on *Buchanan*. He himself (who

was

was not to be taught Grammar by *Lily*, or any other of that Profession) could not but be sensible of it, tho' at the same time he knew that it was not without a Precedent; and perhaps he set it up as a *crux Grammaticis* to rack their Wits upon. Tho', no doubt, he could have given us more pat Examples himself; yet I think those brought by Mr. *Love* are sufficient to justify him. Great Authors have sometimes bold Strokes, which are not to be scan'd by the narrow and precise Rules of Grammarians. Not to mention a great many such, which their Commentators have observ'd in *Cicero*, *Sallust*, *Livy* and others: What think you of that of *Virgil*, *Æn.* vii. 624. which the great *Muretus* is much surpriz'd at,

*Pars pedes ire parat campis, pars arduus altis*

*Pulverulentus equis furit; —*

where *ardus* and *pulverulentus* are construed with *pars*, and ought to have been, according to *Lily*, *ardua* and *pulverulenta*: Or, (if you take the Word *pars* collectively for *quidam*) *ardui* and *pulverulenti*? And that of *Horace*, *Epod.* vii. 11.

*Neque hic lupis mos, nec fuit leonibus*

*Nunquam, nisi in dispar, feris.*

So all the best Copies have it, and only some few *dispar genus*. But if the former reading is the right one, and had *Buchanan* wrote so, you would call him a Dunce, and tell him, that he should have written *disparis*, or *disparia*, or else mended his Verse some other way. And, which comes nearer our Purpose, in the same *Horace*, *Epod.* viii. 7.

*Sed incitant me pectus & mammae putres,*

*Equina quales ubera:*

Where you would tell him, it should be *qualia*. And in *Virgil*, *Æn.* x. 364.

*— quales sub nubibus atris*

*Strymoniae dant signa grues, —*

which you would say should be *qualia*. But if these will not suffice, there is one that will effectually do the Business, viz. that of *Terence*, *Eun.* ii. 1. 20.

*Dii boni, adeon' homines immutarier*

*Ex amore, ut non cognoscas eundem esse,*

as all the Copies invariably have it, for *eosdem* \*. Where is then the great Solecism that *Buchanan* should, after *carmina* in the 4th, or *verba* in the 5th Couplet, say *Quale canebamus*, *carmen* being understood; or, if you will, *unum aliquod ex nostris carminibus, quale canebamus*, &c. †

You cannot pass these Couplets without a Wipe at the *Versification*. “The same Fault, *say you*, occurs in them, “as in the former; four of them are in the lowest way imaginable, the two last just tolerable.” You are here certainly hinting at your *Pauses*, in which I am so blind that I cannot see the least Fault in them, or the smallest Difference betwixt them, and what answers to them in *Johnston*. Nay, if you will take in your *Alliterations*, *Assonancies* and *Rhymings*, (which upon other Occasions are with you of singular Importance) you have all of them here in great abundance, and but few of them in *Johnston*.

(4.) We go now forward with you to *Buchanan*’s 8th Couplet, and *Johnston*’s 6th; where you tell us, “that “in *Buchanan*,

“*Siccine divinos Babylon irrideat hymnos?*

“*Audiat & sanctos terra profana modos?*

“there is a sort of playing with Words, which falls very

“short of the Original; *Shall a profane Land hear holy*

“*Songs*, is a kind of Epigrammatick Wit, and not proper

“for this Place. As to the Language, *divinos hymnos*

“and *sanctos modos* is very much the same thing; the *Ver-*

“*sification*, as usual, is in the gentle Stile of

“*Quem tua Penelope*, &c.”

There is no *playing with Words* in the Case: For that holds only when Words near in Sound have a very different

\* I might also instance that of *Johnston*, Ps. cvi. 7. *Hoc latuit*, [or as your Edition has it, *Hoc latuit*] *Pharis celi quæ Rector in oris Præstitit*; where, according to *Lily* and other Grammarians, he should have said *quod*, not *quæ*; or *elce latuerunt*, not *latuit*. And is it not as great a Solecism to say *Hoc quæ*, as to say *carmina quale*? — See the Note above, p. 48.

† This is much countenanc’d by the Orig. Sing us ONE of the Songs of Zion. Heb. *Shiru lanu mishir Tziion*. *Vatabl.* and *Pagnin*. *Cantate vobis de cantico Sion*. And immediately before, *Dibre shir*, i. e. *verba cantici*.



ferent Sense: and is much of the same kind with our *Puns*, of which we have great Numbers in *Plantus*, and some even in *Cicero* himself; but nothing like them in this Place. See *Quintilian. Inst. lib. vi. cap. 3.* and *Scaliger, Poet. lib. iv. cap. 33.* We have indeed here a Repetition of the same Sentiment, but in Words noway agreeing in Sound; which you elsewhere. in your Note on *Johnston*, *Pf. ii. 4.* acknowledge to be (as it really is) of great Force and Significancy in sacred Poems. Besides, we have here a beautiful Opposition of *Babylon* and *terra profana* to *divinos hymnos* and *sanctos modos*. And if the two first and two last are much the same thing, so are *barbita pacta Deo*, and the *sacræ lyræ*; and the *peregrina genti* and *prostituisse* in *Johnston*. Wherein *Buchanan* falls short of the Original, I see not. So far from it, that he heightens, and, if I may say so, improves it, by giving us both *divinos hymnos* and *sanctos modos*, for the *Lord's Song*, and *Babylon* and *terra profana* for a *strange Land*; so that he has exceeded, not come short of the *Orig.* And so likewise has your *Johnston* done; only, instead of *Song*, he names the *musical Instruments* on which these Songs should have been play'd, the *barbita* and the *lyræ*.

You conclude, that *Buchanan's* Versification is in the gentle Stile of *Ovid's Quem tua Penelope*, &c. I believe that *Horace's Quem tu Melpomene* has been partly running in your Head, else you would have read it, *Hanc tua Penelope*, as *Ovid* wrote it, and as you have, upon second Thoughts, corrected it among your *Errata*. But waving this, what better Pattern (tho' there does not appear much of that) could *Buchanan* follow in this kind of Verse, than *Ovid* the Prince of *Elegiack* Poetry, at least with respect to the Sweetness and Musicalness of his Numbers? But, whatever is in that, it comes ill from you to jeer *Buchanan* on that Score, when, whoever will carefully compare both together, must see that *Ovid* is the chief Exemplar and Model upon, and according to which *Dr. Johnston* has not only formed his *Psalms*, but all his other Works.

(5.) Go we on then to *Buchanan's* 9th and 10th Couplets:

O So,

*O Solyme, O adyta, & sacri penetralia templi,  
Ullane vos animo delectat hora meo.*

*Comprecor, ante mea capiant me oblivia dextra,  
Nec memor arguta sit mea dextra lyra:*

Than which, tho' there can be nothing more beautiful, yet, as you are resolv'd that nothing in him should please you, you tell us, " That the Translation is here too diffused in the first Couplet; that the second Couplet is a " nauseous spinning out of a wrong Thought, as you had " observed before. As to the Language, *meo, mea, me* " and *mea*, seem to be something puerile in four Verses."

1. You say, that in the first of these Couplets *the Translation is too diffused*; whereas any other would highly admire it, for the most moving and affecting *Pathos* that is express'd in it, by the redoubled Exclamation, *O Solyme, O adyta, &c.* This therefore that you condemn in *Buchanan* is one of his most shining Excellencies, and superior to any thing that ever *Johnston* wrote. It is a perfect Imitation of Nature, and very much resembles that of *Virgil, Æn. ii. 241.*

*O patria, O Divum domus Ilium, & incluta bello  
Mœnia Dardanidum! —*

and that, *Ibid. v. 281.*

*O lux Dardania! spes O fidissima Teucrum!  
Quæ tantæ tenere moræ? —*

like to which is that of our Author, *Pf. xcii.*

*O opera! facta O magna verè! O sub cava  
Consilia nube condita!*

You yourself highly extol these Exclamations, *Supplem. p. 12 and 13. in Johnston*; but their Beauty immediately fades, if they are but touch'd by *Buchanan's* Hands. *O the Power, O the Inchantment of Prejudice!*

2. Of the following Couplet, *Comprecor ante mea, &c.* you say, " That it is a nauseous spinning out a wrong " Thought." That the Thought is just, I have proved before, *p. 141.* What you call a *spinning it out*, is the great Beauty of it; it being natural for Persons under a deep Grief or Sorrow, to dwell as it were upon the mournful Thought, and to lament *again and again* their

woful

woful Condition, sometimes in the same, sometimes in different Words. Let any Man read the Book of *Job*, or the *Lamentations* of *Jeremiah*, and he will soon be convinc'd of this Truth.

3. And this will likewise serve for an Answer to the Exception you take to the Repetition of the Words *meo*, *meæ*, *me* and *mea*; which you say with more than your usual Modesty, that it [only] *SEEMS to be something puerile in four Verses*; and you repeat it again in your Remarks upon the following Couplet. For it is also natural for Persons in great Trouble or Misery to use these Pronouns very frequently. Examples we have of this, as in many others, in *Hezekiah*, when he was sick to Death, if a Miracle had not prevented it, *Isa.* xxxviii. from *ψ.* 10 to 20. and in the above *Jeremiah*, bewailing the dismal Calamity of his native Country and People, *Lament.* iii. from *ψ.* 1 to 22. and from *ψ.* 47 to 64. in which we have the Words *I*, *me* and *mine* constantly repeated, and almost without Interruption. I know, your Friend Dr. Trapp, *Praelect. poet. vol. ii. p. 30.* has blam'd *Ovid* for making too frequent an Use of these Pronouns, and I think upon very slender Grounds. For he does not seem to have considered that a great deal of *Ovid's* Works run in a mournful and complaining Strain, wherein the Passions are much moved, and where of consequence there is much occasion for speaking of ourselves, or of addressing to and expostulating with others. That in these therefore *Ovid* should frequently use these Pronouns, *meus*, *tuus*, *suus*, &c. is not much to be wondred. That these should commonly happen at the End of the *Pentameter*, (which made them the more noticeable to the Doctor) is owing to the Nature of his Verse, which renders that the properest Place for them, especially as he generally concludes that Line with a Dissyllable; and not as *Propertius*, *Tibullus* and others before him, who very often end it with Words of three, four or five Syllables. In short, whatever our modern Criticks may think, it is certain the Ancients did not mind such Trifles as these.

It is much that you own in the End, that the *Verseification* is better than usual. And this Compliment I take to be



be entirely owing to the two *Comma's*, one at *Solyme*, and the other at *Comprecor*, and both out of the common Pause, as you reckon them; tho' really and truly they have the *Cæsura* at the usual Place. This is a novel Fancy of your own, and which I could almost swear that neither Ancients nor Moderns ever before dream'd of. But besides these, we have some of your beloved *Alliterations*, and no fewer than three of your plain direct *Rhimes*, *animo — meo*, and *meæ — dextræ*, and *argutæ — lyræ*.

(6.) As to what you say of the 11th and 12th of *Buchanan's* Couplets;

*Os mihi destituat vox, arescente palato,  
Hereat ad fauces aspera lingua meas:  
Prima mihi vestræ nisi sint præconia laudis,  
Hinc nisi letitiæ surgat origo meæ.*

"That the two first Lines are a Repetition of the same Thought; that we have here again *mihi* and *meas* in the first Distich; and *mihi* and *meæ* in the second, "And that the Versification is as usual, *i. e. bad*:" I have answered already; and I shall only add here, that in Point of Prudence and for your Favourite's sake, you should have spared your 2d and 3d Objections. For he in Pf. 86th in the Space of 17 Couplets has these Pronouns *me*, *mihi*, *mea*, &c. and *tu*, *te*, *tibi*, *tuus*, *tua*, *tuis*, *sui*, &c. 36 times; whereas *Buchanan* in that Psalm has only half that Number of them. And as to the Versification, that of the last Line must certainly be good; for *Johnston* has thought fit to borrow it from *Buchanan*: not in this indeed, for that would have been too remarkable, but in another, *viz.* the xcii. Pf. 5. 4.

*Hinc quoque letitiæ surget origo meæ.* And that with as little Variation as that of *Buchanan* in the 6th Couplet of this Psalm, taken from *Ovid*, of which above. We see then that *Johnston* can be guilty of Plagiarism as well as *Buchanan*: And it cannot be said of him as of *Virgil*, that he did *colligere aurum ex stercore Ennii*; for he has carried all the *stercus*, if there is any in it, as well as the *aurum*, along with him. It is moreover observable that *Buchanan* has a *Comma* at the uncommon Pause, *viz.* after *vox*, in the first of these Couplets. And if there

there is any additional Beauty in your Alliterations, Assonancies, &c. *Buchanan* has the Advantage. For he has the Syllables *ni-fi-ti-ti-ri*- chiming to one another 5 times in the last of these Lines, and also the *hemistichial Rhyme* in it, *letitiæ—meæ*: Whereas *Johnston* in his Distich,

*Te nisi tollat ovans unum super omnia, lingua*

*Faucibus hærescat fidere tacta meis,*

seems to have none of them, unless it be the *conclusive scanning Rhyme*, *omnia—lingua*.

(7.) You at first highly commend *Buchanan's* 13th and 14th Couplets; for you say "That the Interpretation is very just; that the Sense of the Original is fully express'd without any Deviations or Omissions." This is very much from you; but this notwithstanding, they have in other Respects many Faults; which that we may the better examine into, we will be obliged to set down the Lines, viz.

*At tu (quæ nostræ insultavit lata rapinæ)*

*Gentis Idumææ tu memor esto, Pater.*

*Diripite, ex imis evertite fundamentis,*

*Æquaque, clamabant, reddite tecta solo.*

"The Language, you tell us, is in them very low, "the *Pater* is stuck in most miserably in the first Couplet, and the *clamabant* in the second" As to the Lowness of the Style, as we have nothing but your Word for it, we may answer with King *Perseus* to *Q. Marcius* the Roman Ambassador, *Quæ verbo objecta, verbo negare sit*: *Liv. xlii. 41.* As to the Word *Pater*, which you alledge to be most miserably stuck in, in the 1st Couplet, we may say to much the same Purpose, what *Diogenes* said to a Boy that was foolishly throwing Stones in the midst of a Throng of People; *Beware that you do not hurt your Father.* For your favourite Author, who according to you, *Nil molitur ineptè*, uses the Word, and that much oftner than *Buchanan*, absolutely, as here, and without any Addition, for *Almighty God.* See him *Pf. vi. 4. xviii. 9. xix. 12. xxxv. 22. xxxix. 8. lxi. 10. lxi. 29.* and a great many other Places. And yet this is no Fault either in *Buchanan* or him: For tho', as the Apostle speaks,

speaks, *There be Gods many, and Lords many*, as there are yet many more *Fathers*: Yet there is nothing more common both in sacred and profane Writings, than to name the *supreme Being*, emphatically, and by way of *Eminence*, *God, Lord and Father*; as he is here in the *Orig.* simply call'd *Lord*; to which *Johnston* has added *scelerum ultor*, which in *Buchanan*, as there is nothing for it in the Text, you would have accounted a mere Expletive.

But the oddest Thing of all is, that you blame *Buchanan's clamabant*, when *Johnston* uses the same Word. And, if it should be pretended, that the *Nominative* is here wanting to it in *Buchanan*, *gentis Idumææ* (to which it refers) being put in an *oblique Case*; the same is equally true of *Johnston*, *Idumes* being likewise an *oblique Case*. And, if in the one *Idume* may be understood as a *Nominative* to that *Verb*, why not *gens Idumææ* in the other? I might further observe (what you reckon a great Beauty in Poetry, *Pref. Disc.* p. 32 and 44.) that *Buchanan* has inverted the Phrase, as you express it, by delaying or suspending the Verb *clamabant* to the 2d Line, which *Johnston* has put almost in the Beginning of the 1st. Besides he has inserted without Book, and I am afraid without any great Use,

*Tectaque montanis mox habitanda feris.* And lastly, he has both *tecta* and *templum*, which either signify the same Thing, and so the one is an idle Addition: Or the latter must be applied to the Buildings of *Jerusalem*, and not the Temple; and if so your Author has fallen into your *Anticlimax*. I do not quarrel any of these Things; but am sure, had they been in *Buchanan*, you would.

I am a little surprized, that in the End, you say *That the Versification in Buchanan is not to be blamed*. I was afraid that *insultavit* should have been rejected as a too long and ill sounding Word: But it seems *insultare* in *Virgil* (who would not have scrupled *insultavit*, had it been needful) has saved it. But how the Spondaick Line, *Diripite ex imis*, &c. has escaped, I know not; since in your *Pref. Disc.* p. 51. you tell us that in such Pieces as these, that Sort of Lines would have been very improper,



per, and that therefore your Author judiciously omitted them.

(8.) I pass on with you to *Buchanan's* 15th Distich, where you tell us, "We have here again another of his *Anticlimaxes*."

"*Tu quoque crudeles, Babylon, dabis impia pœnas,*

"*Et rerum instabiles experiere vices.*"

and to make it out you translate it into *English*. This new Figure, for which the Ancients had not a Name, is a very terrible one, and it seems too that there is no avoiding of it. But so far as I can understand its Nature, it has no Place here. For what you call so is nothing else but a beautiful Amplification: *Thou Babylon, shalt also in thy Turn suffer a most severe Punishment, and thereby experimentally feel how uncertain and changeable the State of worldly Affairs is.* If this is an *Anticlimax*, it is of all Figures the most frequent, there being hardly a Sentence, not a Page I am sure, in any good Author without it. The very Beginning of the glorious *Aeneid* furnishes us with several Examples of it, as *Italiam,—Lavinia littora: Vi superam—ob iram Junonis: Conderet urbem—inferret Deos Latio: Quo numine laeso—quidve dolens Regina Deum: Tot volvere casus—tot adire labores &c.* But, *Virgil* himself, it seems, wanted Art (and no wonder that *Buchanan* should) else he had not, and that in *ipso limine*, involved himself into so many of these silly *Anticlimaxes*. But these are all idle Sallies of your own Imagination, invented purely to sully *Buchanan's* Character, tho' had you, as you ought, consider'd Things better, you could not but have seen that the most noble Verses in the World would have equally, at least in that Respect, been affected by them.

In the End however, you commend *Buchanan's* Language, tho' you add, "That the Versification is, as usual, in the lowest Class." What you understand by the lowest Class, I know not. If you mean the *stylus humilis*, even that is not amiss in *Elegiacks* and on a mournful Subject: tho' I believe, as *Buchanan* has managed it both here and through the whole Psalm, the Style approaches nearer to what we call the *mediocris*.  
And

And you'll forgive me to think that your *Johnston* has strain'd the matter too high, especially with his—*quibus astra laceffis Culmina*, which, as it has no Foundation in the *Orig.* so to me it seems too lofty both for the Subject and the Kind of Verse.

(9.) We are now come to *Buchanan's* two last Couplets.

*Felix qui nostris accedet cladibus ultor,  
Reddet ad exemplum qui tibi damna tuum.  
Felix qui tenero consperget saxa cerebro,  
Eripiens gremio pignora cara tuo.*

In these, that you may be of a Piece with yourself, and end as you have begun, you find also several Faults.

As 1st, tho' you own that the Sense is well express'd, yet you "except that the *Eripiens gremio pignora cara tuo* should have been before the preceeding Line;" But why before it? The Sense indeed is suspended, which you make a Beauty elsewhere: For, I hope if you were explaining this Distich to a School-Boy, you would order it thus; *Felix, qui eripiens cara pignora gremio tuo consperget saxa tenero eorum cerebro*. But if your Doctrine is to be followed, then we must bid farewell to that artificial Order, which is the peculiar Excellency of the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues, and exchange it for the natural one, which our modern Languages are so much tied down to.

Next you say, That the *Language* is of the middling kind, that is, as I take it, it is (as it should be) in *style mediocri*, or pure, plain and natural, and not tainted with those flaunting and gawdy Ornaments, which the Poets as well as Prose-Writers after the *Augustan* Age too much affected, and you seem to be not a little fond of.

What you conclude with, that the *Verseification* here is very heavy, shall with me, and, I suppose, with all others, pass for just nothing. Only, if you will allow us to put a Comma after *Felix* in *Buchanan's* 1st and 3d Lines, as you do after *Felicem* in the same Lines in *Johnston* (as I am sure there is the same Reason equally in both) we shall have two of your *uncommon* Pauses which is much in four Lines. As for the rest, he must have

have more penetrating Eyes than *Lyncens* himself, that can perceive any Difference betwixt *Buchanan's* and *Johnston's* Versification through this whole Psalm, unless that *Johnston* happens to have the uncommon Pause here and in his 3d Couplet; i. e. on the *Cæsura* after Foot 3d; which *Buchanan* probably avoided, as not being suitable in a mournful Subject: As on the contrary *Buchanan* abounds with them in Subjects of a more chearful Nature, where yet *Johnston* has few or none of them. See above p. 181.

When you have finished your Comparison of the two Paraphrases of this Psalm, it is no Wonder, as you have managed Matters, that in the End you break out with an *Io Pæan!* and sing a Triumph to your imaginary Victory, in these Words, "I have now gone through this most renowned Psalm Verse by Verse, and, if I am not much mistaken, shown the Emptiness of it in all Respects, when compared with *Johnston*." But, as I have also gone through all your Cavils against *Buchanan* in this Psalm, you will allow me likewise to boast in my Turn, that, if I am not much mistaken, I have shew'd the Emptiness of them in all Respects; and that this Psalm of his, is really (and not ironically as you call it) a *renown'd Psalm*, and superior to *Johnston's* or any other Version whatsoever. And I will add, that, on the other Hand, should the one half of what you have advanc'd against him in this Psalm prove true, I would give up *Buchanan* for ever, and pronounce of him, that he is not only not to be compared with *Johnston*, but that he is, what *Catullus* said too modestly of himself, *Pessimus omnium poeta*, or, in other Words, *no Poet at all*.

**B**UT you cannot stop here, for having, in your own Conceit, succeeded so well in the Attack you have now made upon this *Psalm*, you go on to speak contemptuously of all the rest. For you add, "That this would be the Case, if you was to compare every Verse from one End to the other of the Psalms, the civ. not upon any Account excepted." After which you say (and it is the only thing almost in which you and I do agree) "That it would be a very usefess Labour to pursue this

P

" Sub.



" Subject any further." Had you continued to think so, I am pretty confident, you would have not only saved yourself a good deal of what you own to be a superfluous Trouble, but also have less injured your own Reputation. But, as useless as you now think the Labour to be, you cannot give it over. For besides some Thrusts you here give at *Buchanan's* celebrated 104th Psalm, in your Margin, and the more rigorous handling you give it and the 1st Psalm afterwards, in what you call your *Conclusion*, you cannot forbear condemning in *cumulo* all his Psalms that are written in other Kinds of Verse than *Heroick* and *Elegiack*, and tell us " That there are still " twenty different Species of Verse remaining, in each " of which *Johnston* excells *Buchanan*." You certainly mean the 119th Psalm, whose twenty two Stanzas *Johnston* has translated into as many different Kinds of *Metre*. It is something odd that *Buchanan*, who had dealt more in that Variety of Verse than *Johnston*, should yet be excell'd by him. But for this we have only your Word, and how much that is to be relied on, we have seen above.

But you add *p*, 41. " That there is one Sort, in which " *Buchanan* stands unrival'd, and that is the Metre in " which he has translated the cv. cxix. cxxiv. and the " cxxix. Psalms. These make, *you say*, altogether several hundred Lines; and the Measure (it seems) is " that in which *Plautus* and *Terence* have writ their Comedies. I leave the Reader to judge whether this is " not making a *Farce* of the Psalms: For as to this " Kind of Versification it has, with regard to 999, even " learned Readers, in 1000, only just Verse enough in it " to make it not Prose, and Prose enough to make it " not Verse. In reality it would have been more respectful, both to the Work itself and to the Reader, to have " omitted these Psalms intirely, than to have translated " them in this absurd manner."

I have set down your Words at full Length; which indeed make a real *Farce*, to say no worse; I never having seen any thing more unjust or more injudicious. To aggravate the matter, you say, *they make altogether several*

*al hundred Lines.* They are in all just 300, neither more nor less. But what is that to the Purpose? if they are of so bad a Kind as you represent them, 10 of them were too many: But if otherwise (as I shall shew anon,) there is no Harm in their Number, especially as the *cyth* makes 45, and the *cxixth* 176 Verses in the Orig. It is not true that they are of the same Measure with that of *Plautus* and *Terence's* Comedies. For these are generally of the *octonarian Iambicks* mix'd with some other lesser Kinds; but with vast *Licences* and *Negligences* in all the Measures or Feet, except the last. Whereas these of *Buchanan* are of a different Species, call'd *Trochaick*, consisting always of 7 Feet and an half, wherein all the Laws of Metre is throughout and in every Foot most strictly observ'd, and is the same with that of which you (by a Mistake) have given us a Scheme in this same *Suppl. p. 18.* as I have noted above. There is therefore no Comparison betwixt them and those others, save only that they are long, and consist of more Feet than *Heroicks* or other Kinds do. And whereas you say that, even among learned Men, not above one of a thousand can well distinguish them from Prose: If it is so with you in *England*, I am sorry for it; but hope it is not true. I am sure that with us, and, I doubt not, in every Country where *Latin* Poetry is in any Esteem, there is not a School Boy, that has a tolerable Knowledge of Prosody, that cannot with as much, nay more Ease, distinguish these *Trochaicks* from Prose, as they can *Hexameters* from *Pentameters*; *Choriambicks* from *Alcaicks*; *Sapphicks* from *Phealencians*, &c. And why should they be thought improper for the *Psalms*? when we have (besides some Epigrams) among the ancients that most beautiful Poem, call'd the *Pervigilium Veneris*, a great deal of *Terentianus Maurus*, and of Christian Writers two very long ones of *Prudentius*, and, among other *Ecclesiastical Hymns*, that glorious one of *Venantius Fortunatus*, which begins with,

*Pange, lingua, gloriosi | praelium certaminis,  
Et super crucis tropaeum | dic triumphum nobilem,  
Qualiter Redemptor orbis | immolatus vicerit.*

He that cannot distinguish this from Prose, knows neither the one nor the other. I pass some of that Kind of the truly *Great H. Grotius*, especially that excellent one on the blessed Sacrament, which your Friend *Mr. Lauder* has (to do him Justice) very elegantly translated into *English Verse* \*. There is another however, which I cannot omit mentioning, one of the most elegant as well as instructive Poems, that I almost ever read, done in that Sort of Verse by the learned *Tobias Gutberleth*, called *Ecloga, per angusta ad angusta*, and subjoined to the *Variorum* Edition of *Petronius*, Anno 1669 8vo. It consists of 250 Lines, not much short of the Number of Lines in all the four Psalms of *Buchanan* composed in that Kind of Verse. As an Example both of the Beauty of the Verse, and the Piety of the Author, I thought it not amiss to give you these following :

*Bis beatus, ter beatus, | millies beatus est,  
 Paginam viam salutis | qui sacra ti codicis  
 Phosphoro surgente mane | lucis almae nuntio,  
 Ingruente prodromoque | noctis Hesperugine,  
 Volvit ardens & revolvit | sedulo conamine;  
 Et Creatoris secundum | iussa sancta, criminis  
 Purus, integerque vitae | vivit usque, & ambulat;  
 Fundit hymnos atque psalmos, | gratiasque debitas,  
 Evehitque ad astra celi | conditorem laudibus,  
 Et rudes commilitones | fraudis experts edocet  
 Veritatis & salutis | æviterne semitam.*

Which is a Kind of Paraphrase of the Beginning of the 1st Psalm. And that this noble Poet was well acquainted with *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, we have a good Proof from these Lines a little below :

*Bis beatus, ter beatus, millies beatus est,  
 who by deep Study in Philosophy has learned, among a  
 great many other Things,  
 Spiritus quid sit caduco | separatus corpore,*

*Quid-*

---

\* I might also mention one of the most polite and elegant Writers both in Prose and Verse, of the last Age, I mean the famous *Dominicus Baudens*, among whose Poems his *Trochaicks* bear a considerable Bulk.



*Quidque homo sit, cur creatus, | quotque constet par-  
tibus;*

*Quæ feræ silvis, pecusque | pascuis inambulet,*

*Quique pennarum volatu | præpete ales aëra,*

*Quique pinnarum natatu | piscis æquor permeet, &c.*

which two last Lines are certainly an Imitation of these Lines in *Buchanan's* viii. Psalm.

*Quique pennarum celeri volatu*

*Metitur ales aëra,*

*Quique pinnarum celeri natatu*

*Piscis pererrat æquora.*

In short the whole Poem is, in my Opinion, so noble and excellent, that I would be more vain to have been the Author of it,

*Quàm Fidenarum Gabiorumque esse potestas.\**

You see then how far you and I (and I hope I do not stand single) differ in our Sentiments concerning that Kind of Verse. I beg leave to add, that this Difference seems to have proceeded from your not knowing, at least not adverting to the particular Contexture and Frame of it, which consists chiefly in these two Things, 1<sup>st</sup>, That (as most other Kinds) it divides itself into two Hemistichs, the first whereof is made up of four Feet, and the second of three Feet and an half. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That

P 3

the

\* This Author, who was Rector of the School of *Lewwarden* in *West-Friesland*, has writ a whole Book of *Trochaicks*, published with his other Poems by his Son *Werner Gutberleth*, *Leowardia* 1667. And Mr. *Benson* ought to have the greater Esteem of him, that he has writ a fine Epigram on Dr. *Johnston's* Psalms, which, because it is little known, I shall here set down;

*Arthurus vicinus ovans Arturus anhelat*

*Jessiaden Elege non metuente mori,*

*Et Buchananea non degener accola ripa,*

*Nata Caledonia plestra sub axe movet.*

*Conticeant Tibris, Ligeris, Rhenusque, Tagusque,*

*Scotia Davidica sufficit una lyra.*

In another Epigram, in *Psalterii Davidici Paraphrasis Poet. Lat.* after he has reckoned up no fewer than 27 of them, he concludes,

*Fama favens Borea talia dicta dedit:*

*Scotia sola canit calo calanda perenni,*

*Auribus apta Remi Scotia sola canit.*

*Scotia sola canit memori dignissima cedro,*

*Auribus apta Dei Scotia sola canit.*

the fourth Foot of the 1st Hemistich should always end with a Word, and without any *Cæsura*: So that it would be a Blemish in those *Trochaicks*, which is reckoned a Beauty in *Heroicks* and most other Species, where the Want of a *Cæsura* at the Close of the 1st Hemistich makes the Verse sound harsh and disagreeable.\* These Things will appear more plain, after I have told you, that in the old Editions of *Prudentius*, and the first three or four of *Buchanan's* 105th Psalm, the two Hemistichs are divided, as in that Psalm, thus:

*Canite dominum, & invocate*

*Nomen ejus, exteris*

*Facta gentibus per orbem*

*Prædicate illustria, &c.†*

And if we will believe the most learned (especially in that Matter) Dr. *Hare*, the late Bishop of *Chichester*, the whole Book of Psalms are composed of such short Verses as these, and all of them in *Iambick* or *Trochaick* Measures: Had all these Things been duly considered by you, you would not have tax'd *Buchanan*, as acting absurdly in the Choice he has made of translating four of his *Psalms* in that Kind of Metre.

**I**N the End of this your *Supplement*, as if you had not said enough to disgrace this our Author with Respect to his Psalms, you fall a railing at his other Poems; and tho' you own, "That many of them are adorned with  
" all the Graces of Language, Numbers and Harmony;  
" that *Virgil* and *Horace* may be trac'd through them,  
" not by a dull transcribing of whole Passages, but by  
" the Turn, the Beauty and Strength of the Stile, and  
" the Arts of Verse," that is, that they are free of all those Faults, which his most studied and elaborate Work from one End to the other is full fraught with! Yet  
" the finest of these Pieces are so *obscene*, and some so  
" *lewd* and *impious* both, that they are not to be endured

\* As in that of *Horace*, *Non quivis videt immodulata poemata iudex*, where for Want of the *Cæsura*, the Verse seems to stagger or reel, as *Baudozianus de re poet.* fol. 49. observes.

† For which Reason, I have in the Examples above, separated the two Hemistichs by a Dash or Stroke in the Middle,

"ed." And thence you infer that such an Author should not be read by young ones, even when he writes of sacred and religious Subjects. That some of *Buchanan's* other Poems are not so agreeable to the Rules of Modesty, as by the strict Laws of Christianity they ought, shall be granted you. But then these are comparatively but very few, and are so far from being the finest of his Productions, that if any thing can be called mean or low that came from so masterly a Hand, they may be reckoned of that Number. That any of them deserve the Name of *impious* I flatly refuse; and even that one, which you mention as one of the worst of them, is not so bad as you represent it. The Lines you refer us to, are *Hendec. vii.*

*Judaum, Beleago quod negas te,  
Et vis testibus id probare magnis,  
Erras, testibus ista non probatur*

*Res, (ut scis, puto) mentulâ probatur.*

The Import whereof I take to be this: The Person here, by a fictitious Name call'd *Beleago*, seems to have been a Professor of Philosophy, and not improbably Colleague to our *Buchanan* in the University of *Coimbra*, lately then founded by *John III.* King of *Portugal*. And it would appear that when *Buchanan* was ejected out of that University, upon Suspicion of Heresy, this *Beleago* was one of his greatest Enemies and Accusers: Which gave Occasion to *Buchanan* to write this, and other five *Epigrams*, or *Invectives* against him, viz. *Iamb. vi. vii. viii. ix.* and *Epig. i. 18.* In this first which you cite, our Author insinuates that this *Beleago* was suspected to be a *Jew*, and that he was obliged to bring *Witnesses* to prove the contrary; and the Wit of the *Epigram* lies in playing upon the double *Entendre* of the Word *testes*, and concluding with telling *Beleago* that the best Proof he could bring of his not being a *Jew*, was to shew that he was not *circumcised*. And what is there in it, except perhaps one immodest Word, that can be so very offensive. This I am sure of, that many *Christian* Poets (otherwise, I charitably believe, very good Men) your own *Dr. Johnson* not excepted, have taken as great, nay greater *Freedom*



doms than this. It ought moreover to be considered, that the few Pieces \* *Buchanan* has of that Sort, were the *Lusus ingenii* of his younger Years; all which he would not probably have made publick, had not his Friends, into whose Hands some of them had formerly fallen, in a Manner extorted them from him. This is what he declares himself, in his Letter to *Peter Daniel*, 24 July 1566, "*Quod ad me attinet*, says he, *non magnopere laborabam, ut ea [carmina] ab interitu revocarem: argummenta enim fere levia sunt, & quorum hanc etatem nescio pigeat magis an pudeat. Sed quia tantopere amici, quibus nihil denegare vel debeo, vel possum, ea expetebant—quædam per otium recollegi, & in capita conjeci, &c.* But if upon account of these (which are, as I have said, but very few) Boys are not to read his Psalms, then none of the best Verse-Authors, *Catullus*, *Tibullus*, *Propertius*, *Horace*, *Ovid*, *Martial*, *Juvenal*, &c. nay the great *Virgil* himself, who is thought to be the Author of many of the *Priapeia*, should be put into their Hands. What you add, "That there are a great many Persons, that can repeat not a few of *Buchanan's* shameful Lines, that don't know one Verse of his Psalms," is thrown in to exaggerate the matter. These Lines (as I said) are comparatively but very few, and I know not so much as one Person that is taken up with them to the Degree you speak of. Besides, the Editions of his *Psalms* that are used by School-Boys, are generally printed by themselves, without any of his other Poems being joined with them, unless a Hymn or two at the End.

AT

---

\* It was an odd Piece of Conduct, and which few will approve of, in *Mr. Lauder*, when affecting to shew his Abhorrence of *Buchanan's* Lines that may be offensive to modest Ears, he in his *Calumny display'd* Part II. has thought fit to amass all or most of them together, much the same Way as the Commentators on the ancient Authors, in *usum Delphini*, who omitting the lewd and impure Passages of those Authors in their proper Places, have set them all down together at the End by themselves. By which Means they shew to Persons, whose polluted Fancies are pleas'd with such Things, where they may more readily than otherwise find them.

AT last, p. 43. what was your great and chief Intention, you break out into a *Panegyrick* upon D. *Johnston*; and (*Virgil* alone excepted) you make him not only equal (which had been enough in all Conscience) but superior to all the Writers even of the *Augustan* Age. I have not the least Inclination to rob the Dr. of his just Praise. He was certainly a great Poet, and if not the best, at least equal to the best of the Age he lived in. But to exalt him above those, whom all have hitherto look'd upon as the best in all Ages, and the Test and Standard of all polite Writing, is a Banter upon the Judgment of all that are acquainted with<sup>e</sup> them. *Johnston* himself (were he alive) would repudiate and disdain such high Encomiums, which he very well knew did in no wise belong to him.

You indeed, to make good what you have here advanced, have thought fit to single out one particular Verse of *Tibullus*,

*Et magnas messes terra benigna dabit ;*

and comparing it with that of *Johnston*,

*Farraque sub pedibus fundet opimus ager.*

" Now (*you cry out*) let the gravest and most profound Critick talk two Hours together of the *Augustan* Age, and the *cultus Tibullus*, yet shall he never persuade me that *Johnston* does not vastly surpass *Tibullus* in this Passage. In reality, *Tibullus*'s Line is the Line of a School-Boy, in Comparison to *Johnston*'s: And where had *Johnston* this inimitable Way of Writing? It is easily seen:

" *Sed si triticeam in messem robustaque farra*

" *Exercebis humum.*——Georg. i. 220.

" *Fundet humo facilem victum justissima tellus.* ii. 460.

" Now (*say you*) if *Johnston* excels *Tibullus* in one Line, why not in a thousand, for the same Reason? Hence (*you add*) it appears that this Work is to be esteem'd equal to most classic Authors, and greatly superior to such a mean Piece as *Ovid de Tristibus*."

Here we have a Piece of curious Reasoning. Because *Johnston* excell'd *Tibullus* (as you fancy) in one Line,  
why

why not in a thousand? What *Johnston* might have done cannot be otherwise known than by what he has done: And tho' it should be found that he has given us a thousand better Lines than this one of *Tibullus*, does it therefore follow that he was a better Poet than the other? Might I not invert the Argument, by simply saying, that if *Tibullus* has excell'd *Johnston* in any one Line, which I hope will not be denied, why not in a thousand; and so be accounted a greater Poet than he? This Reasoning therefore is good for nothing, since it proves equally on either Side. By the same Logick it might be made out, that because there may be found some one Line in *Virgil*, that is exceeded by some one in *Johnston*, *Buchanan*, &c\*. therefore they were better Poets than he. Many have found Fault with even some of that great Author's Verses: But your Country-man Mr. *Markland* has carried the matter very far, by saying in his Preface to his Notes upon *Statius's Sylva*, sub fin. " *Et, ut quod* " *sentio sine ambagibus proferam, addo plurima esse in isto* " *poemate, [Æneide sciz] quæ, si ego (pessimus omnium* " *poeta) versus scriberem, nollem in meis conspici, &c.*" i. e. as I understand him, there are a great many Verses in *Virgil*, which he would be ashamed to be the Author of. This is prodigiously bold, especially from one that owns himself to be a very bad Poet †. Well then, let us suppose that he or you, or any other, should write one Line which you would not be ashamed of, and which of Consequence must be better than those bad ones of *Virgil*, which he is offended with; I much doubt for all that, if either he, or any one for him, would have

\* You yourself *Suppl.* p. 25. own that that Line of *Buchanan's* 5th Pf. *Mitis exaudi mea verba mentis*, is, by the fine Alliterations in it, so very graceful, that to your Ear it is more Musical than *Horace's* *Non eget Mauri jaculis, neque arcu*. Now if *Buchanan* could excel *Horace* in one Line, why not in a thousand, and of Consequence have been a better Poet than *Horace*?

† I am not ignorant of the many bold Emendations made by that otherwise very learned and elegant Critick, especially on *Horace*, in his *Epistola Critica ad eruditissimum Virum Franciscum Hare, Decanum Vigornensem, Cantab.* 1723. 8vo. And I have seen in the Hands of my late worthy Friend Mr. *George Waddel* a Ms. Treatise of the no less learn-



have the Vanity to think himself a better Poet than *Virgil*. I am sure he would not, for with the same Breath, he adds, that "*infinita numero ultra humanae imitationis metas in illo eminent.*" 'Tis possible that a very ordinary Poet may luckily hit upon one good Line, and that one of the first Rank may *dormitare*, as *Homer*, (as well as *Virgil*,) sometimes did, and so give us a bad one. But neither will *this* make the former deserve the Name of a *good*, nor *that* the latter the Name of a *bad* Poet. It is not by single Lines that the Merits of a Poet are to be determined. For tho' a bad one may sometimes stumble (as I may say) upon one bright Verse, yet he may notwithstanding be (as *Horace* expresses it) *Infelix operis summa*,

and very judicious Mr. *Duker*, wherein these Corrections of Mr. *Markland* are animadverted upon, and shew'd for the most part to be without Foundation. I would not have mentioned this, but for the Sake of the glorious *Virgil*, whom he here treats (with all Submission) in a very indecent and unjustifiable manner; and that notwithstanding what he says by way of Introduction to it, in these Words, *De Virgilii Aeneide, quibusdam in locis (præcipue p. 302 Col. i.) liberius quam mos est, opinatus sum. Hujus opinionis audaciam expavet eruditus quidam amicus meus, cuius causâ,* and then follows what is cited above, *et ut quod sentio, &c.* I had the Curiosity to look to that Passage of *Virgil* he refers us to, which is *Aeneid. vi. 378.*

*Nam tua finitimi longè latèque per urbes,  
Prodigiis ætæ caelestibus, ossa piabunt.*

On which he passes this Censure, *Hic locus, nisi omnia me fallunt, insigni absurditate factus est. Si enim FINITIMI, quomodo LONGE LATEQUE per urbes? idem est ac si dixisset FINITIMI LONGINQVI piabunt tua ossa: quod sane mirum ducerem, nisi quod nihil mirum habendum est in opere tam imperfecto.* This is intolerable, and no wonder that his learned Friend was amazed at such Boldness. I must add further, that when the matter is considered better, there will no Reason be found for such Assertions. For 1<sup>st</sup>, *LONGE LATEQUE* is not always to be taken in that strict Sense, for far and near, as we commonly *English* it, but only as these Towns lay round about or border'd upon *Velia* in Length and Breadth. But 2<sup>dly</sup>, Suppose we should take the Words strictly, where is the Impropriety, far less the Absurdity, of saying, that these Towns with the Territories belonging to them bordered upon *Velia*, tho' some of them were more remote from, or nearer to it than others? And might not all these be called *urbes finitimæ*? And might it not be said of the old *Romans*, when engaged in War with many of the Cities or States around them, the *Aequi*, *Volsi*, *Hernici*, *Rutuli*, *Aurunci*, &c. that they *finitimis populis longè latèque arma intulerunt*, or *finitimorum agros longè latèque depopulari sunt*. But this *en passant*, which the Injury done to the immortal *Virgil* has extorted from me,

why not in a thousand? What *Johnston* might have done cannot be otherwise known than by what he has done: And tho' it should be found that he has given us a thousand better Lines than this one of *Tibullus*, does it therefore follow that he was a better Poet than the other? Might I not invert the Argument, by simply saying, that if *Tibullus* has excell'd *Johnston* in any one Line, which I hope will not be denied, why not in a thousand; and so be accounted a greater Poet than he? This Reasoning therefore is good for nothing, since it proves equally on either Side. By the same Logick it might be made out, that because there may be found some one Line in *Virgil*, that is exceeded by some one in *Johnston*, *Buchanan*, &c\*. therefore they were better Poets than he. Many have found Fault with even some of that great Author's Verses: But your Country-man Mr. *Markland* has carried the matter very far, by saying in his Preface to his Notes upon *Statius's Sylva*, sub fin. " *Et, ut quod* " *sentio sine ambagibus proferam, addo plurima esse in isto* " *poemate, [Æneide sciz] quæ, si ego (pessimus omnium* " *poeta) versus scriberem, nollem in meis conspici, &c.*" i. e. as I understand him, there are a great many Verses in *Virgil*, which he would be ashamed to be the Author of. This is prodigiously bold, especially from one that owns himself to be a very bad Poet †. Well then, let us suppose that he or you, or any other, should write one Line which you would not be ashamed of, and which of Consequence must be better than those bad ones of *Virgil*, which he is offended with; I much doubt for all that, if either he, or any one for him, would have

\* You yourself *Suppl. p. 25.* own that that Line of *Buchanan's* 5th Pl. *Mitis exaudi mea verba mentis*, is, by the fine Alliterations in it, so very graceful, that to your Ear it is more Musical than *Horace's* *Non eget Mauri jaculis, neque arcu*. Now if *Buchanan* could excel *Horace* in one Line, why not in a thousand, and of Consequence have been a better Poet than *Horace*?

† I am not ignorant of the many bold Emendations made by that otherwise very learned and elegant Critick, especially on *Horace*, in his *Epistola Critica ad eruditissimum Virum Franciscum Hare, Decanum Vigornensem, Cantab.* 1723. 8vo. And I have seen in the Hands of my late worthy Friend Mr. *George Waddel* a Ms. Treatise of the no less learn-

have the Vanity to think himself a better Poet than *Virgil*. I am sure he would not, for with the same Breath, he adds, that “*infinita numero ultra humana imitationis metas in illis eminent.*” ’Tis possible that a very ordinary Poet may luckily hit upon one good Line, and that one of the first Rank may *dormitare*, as *Homer*, (as well as *Virgil*,) sometimes did, and so give us a bad one. But neither will *this* make the former deserve the Name of a *good*, nor *that* the latter the Name of a *bad* Poet. It is not by single Lines that the Merits of a Poet are to be determined. For tho’ a bad one may sometimes stumble (as I may say) upon one bright Verse, yet he may notwithstanding be (as *Horace* expresses it) *Infelix operis summa*,

ed and very judicious Mr. *Duker*, wherein these Corrections of Mr. *Markland* are animadverted upon, and shew’d for the most part to be without Foundation. I would not have mentioned this, but for the Sake of the glorious *Virgil*, whom he here treats (with all Submission) in a very indecent and unjustifiable manner; and that notwithstanding what he says by way of Introduction to it, in these Words, *De Virgilii Aeneide, quibusdam in locis (præcipue p. 302 Col. i.) liberius quam mos est, opinatus sum. Hujus opinionis audaciam expavet eruditus quidam amicus meus, cuius causâ,* and then follows what is cited above, *et in quod sentio, &c.* I had the Curiosity to look to that Passage of *Virgil* he refers us to, which is *Aeneid. vi. 378.*

*Nam tua finitimi longè latèque per urbes,*

*Prodigiis æstæ caelestibus, ossa piabunt.*

On which he passes this Censure, *Hic locus, nisi omnia me fallunt, insigni absurditate factus est. Si enim FINITIMI, quomodo LONGE LATEQUE per urbes? idem est ac si dixisset FINITIMI LONGINQUI piabunt tua ossa: quod sane mirum ducerem, nisi quod nihil mirum habendum est in opere tam imperfecto.* This is intolerable, and no wonder that his learned Friend was amazed at such Boldness. I must add further, that when the matter is considered better, there will no Reason be found for such Assertions. For *ist*, *LONGE LATEQUE* is not always to be taken in that strict Sense, for far and near, as we commonly *English* it, but only as these Towns lay round about or border’d upon *Velia* in Length and Breadth. But zdly, Suppose we should take the Words strictly, where is the Impropriety, far less the Absurdity, of saying, that these Towns with the Territories belonging to them bordered upon *Velia*, tho’ some of them were more remote from, or nearer to it than others? And might not all these be called *urbes finitima*? And might it not be said of the old *Romans*, when engaged in War with many of the Cities or States around them, the *Æqui*, *Volsi*, *Hernici*, *Rutuli*, *Aurunci*, &c. that they *finitimis populis longè latèque arma intulerunt*, or *finitimorum agros longè latèque depopulari sunt*. But this *en passant*, which the Injury done to the immortal *Virgil* has extorted from me,



*summâ, quia ponere totum Nescivit*; and I am fully of that same great Author's Mind, in what he after sub-joins,

— *Hunc ego me, si quid componere curem,  
Non magis esse velim, quàm pravo vivere naso,  
Spectandum nigris oculis nigroque capillo.*

And more clearly yet in that noble Epistle of his to *Augustus Cæsar*, lib. ii. Ep. 2. where he condemns his old Præceptor, the *plagosus Orbilius*, for having the same Sentiments you have. For speaking of that most ancient Latin Poet, *Livius Andronicus*, whose Plays were generally very bad, and which *Cicero* says would not bear a second reading, he tells us, that this *Orbilius* discover'd a great Weakness of Judgment, in that for the sake of one or two Verses finer than usual in that Poet, he extoll'd the whole Poem as an excellent Piece. His remarkable Words are,

*Inter quæ verbum emicuit si forte decorum, &  
Si versus paullo concinnior unus & alter;  
Injustè totum ducit venditque poemâ.*

You see then how far you and your Master *Horace* (as you somewhere call him) are divided in Opinion as to this Point.

But what if even that is not the Case here? And that upon a more narrow Inspection, the Difference betwixt those two Lines of *Johnston* and *Tibullus* will not be found such as you imagine? Why? the one has *farra*, and the other *messes*; the one *fundet*, and the other *dabit*: And, to be sure, the *farra* and the *fundet* are more poetical than *messes* and *dabit*, because *Virgil* in his first *Georgick* has the one, and in his second the other! For that is all that *Johnston* has imitated from that Author. But has not *Virgil* sometimes *messes* as well as *farra*, and *dare foetus*, Geo. ii. 442. as well as *fundere victum*? Nay, what if *Johnston* has more of this Line from *Cicero* than from *Virgil*, (which is reckoned an unpardonable Fault in *Buchanan*, as we have seen above, p. 11.) For that Orator has *optimus ager*, Agr. ii. 19. (which *Virgil* has not, tho' he has *opima arva*) and *fundere fruges, flores, baccas*—But (which is more material) what if *messes* and

*daret*

From  
Opin  
propo

daret in *Tibullus* be more proper for the Subject, than either *farra* or *funderet* would have been in that Place? It is in *lib. iii. Eleg. 3.* of which, that the Matter in question may be put in a clearer Light, I shall set down the first 8 Lines, whereof that cited by you is one:

*Quid prodest cœlum votis implēsse, Neera,  
Blandaue cum multa thura dedisse prece?  
Non, ut marmorei prodirem è limine tecti,  
Insignis clarâ conspicuusque domo:  
Aut, ut multa mei renovarent jugera tauri,  
Et magnas messes terra benigna daret:  
Sed tecum ut longæ sociarem gaudia vitæ,  
Inque tuo caderet nostra senectâ sinu.*

This amorous Elegy (than which, whatever you may think of it, nothing can be more exquisitely soft and tender) is, as the Nature of it required, in *stylo mediocri*, and almost *humili*; where every thing is elegant, but at the same time simple and plain, and where the strong Figures and Metaphors, you seem to be too much taken with, would have been egregiously inept and improper \*. That great Poet knew his Business much better. It had been as easy for him, as it could be to *Johnston*, instead of,

*Et multas messes terra benigna daret,*  
to have said, as you, it seems, would have him,  
*Farraque munificè funderet almus ager;*  
but his superior Judgment could not fail to suggest to him,

\* To give yet a farther Proof of the Justness of what I have been advancing, we have a noble Elegy done in Imitation of this of *Tibullus* by one of the greatest Poets of his Age, the celebrated *Sannazarius*; a Part of which I have thought fit here to subjoin.

*O mihi dum tales tumulto reddantur honores,  
Tam lentam Lachesis scindat avara colum:  
Non, ut nostra novos Arabum bibat urna liquores,  
Ustus & Assyrio spiret odore cinis;  
Aut, ut clara mei niteat fama sepulchri,  
Atque marmoreus sidera tangat apex:  
Sed magis ut liceat longas audire querelas,  
Et gerere è lacrymis fersa rigata tuis.*

From this we see how vastly you and that great Italian Poet differ in Opinion concerning *Tibullus*, when he has thought this very Passage so proper for his Imitation.

him, that such a grand and sonorous Line would be the *purpureus pannus* *Horace* speaks of, a glaring Bit of Tinsel, that would disfigure, not adorn all the rest. It was among other things ill advised in you, to call that Line of *Tibullus*, the *Line of a School-Boy*, in *Comparison to Johnston's*; there being nothing more common with young Poets, than on the contrary, instead of a just and well conducted Simplicity, to affect gawdy and florid Words and Expressions, and oftimes, to use *Horace's* Phrase,

*Projicere ampullas & sesquipedalia verba :*

Witness, among others, that otherwise admirable Paraphrase of the 104th Psalm, done by the Lord *Ochiltry*, when he was not fully fifteen Years old; where we have these over-strain'd and bombast Lines,

*Ille sibi ætherei subsellia firma theatri  
Imbriferis contignat aquis, & celsus in axe  
Nimbijugo dat lora volans, vebiturque quadrigâ  
Aëriâ, ventos frenans auriga jugales.*

And these,

*Voce tuâ rampente moras, varioque tumultu  
Horrissonum reboante polo, stupefacta repente  
Fulmineas tremuere minas, testante pavorem  
Terrificum refugo præscripta in mœnia fluctu \*.*

But why should I insist so long on these Things? For, tho' much less might have sufficed to convince others, yet your Prejudices, I see, are so deeply rooted, that there is no Possibility of removing them, or making you in the least alter your Sentiments. This is what appears from that strange Expression of yours, "Now let the gravest and most profound Critick talk two Hours together of the *Augustan* Age, and the *cultus Tibullus*, yet shall he never persuade me, that *Johnston* does not vastly surpass *Tibullus* in this Passage." After such a Declaration

\* Such also are the Verses of the Emperor *Nero*, *Torva Mimallois implerunt cornua bombis*, cited and derided by *Persius*, *Sat. i.* which we may suppose to have been writ by that Emperor, when he was but young; since he was not above 31 Years old, when he freed the World of his monstrous Cruelties.



tion as this, to reason upon the Matter would prove absolutely idle and vain.

What you add afterwards, is a real *Anticlimax*, the true *B&G* or *Sinking*, not in Poetry, but in good Sense. For after you had said, p. 43, that *Johnston has excell'd all the Writers of the Augustan Age except Virgil*; here you fall much lower, by saying, *Hence it appears that this Work is to be esteem'd equal to most Classick Authors*. What! Is he that was superior to all of them except one, now only equal to most of them? But who are these most? Not *Tibullus*, for some of his Lines, say you, are little better than those of a School-Boy. Not *Ovid*, for here you tell us that *Johnston's Work is greatly superior to such a mean Piece, as that Author's de Tristibus*; and in your Conclusion, p. 49. that it is *vastly superior to any Part of Ovid's Works*. There remains then only *Propertius* in the *Elegiack* kind, and in *Lyricks* and *Hexameters* *Horace*, \* whom he is here but equal to, when before you made him superior to them, as well as all others, *Virgil* alone excepted. Nay, tho' in the former Page you except *Virgil*, from whom you say *he learned his wonderful Art, and own that without his Assistance it was impracticable to excel any other Writer of those Times, as you fancy Johnston has done*; yet elsewhere, *Pref. Disc. p. 57.* you make him equal even to that great Author, by telling us, *Whoever attends to the Instances you have before given of Johnston's Style and Verse in so many Places, that not Virgil himself can excel him in Majesty*: And you add, what I think will, if true, make him superior to *Virgil*, that *he has added a Nobleness of Verse to Elegy, which no Roman Poet ever thought of*. From which Words of your's, (tho' I said above that the *Nobleness of Verse* you there speak of, is above my Reach to conceive) yet this much may be fairly concluded, that in your Opinion, had *Virgil* writ any thing that is considerable in the *Elegiack* Way, (for we have very little of that Kind, that we

are

\* I do not mention *Catullus*; for tho' he is otherwise an excellent Poet, and has dealt in the *Lyrick*, *Elegiack* and other Kinds, yet his Numbers are generally rough and the most unharmonious of any.

are sure is his) *Johnston* certainly would have surpass'd him. What you tell us here in the same p. 43. and add, that you are supported in your Opinion by the famous Archbishop of *Cambray*, that it is not impossible but that an Author may arise, that shall excel all the other Writers of the Augustan Age, except *Virgil*.; I shall not only grant you, but go yet farther, by allowing it possible, that some supereminent Genius, in a long Series of Ages, may at last appear, who shall excel, not only those, but even *Virgil*, *Homer*, and the whole Race of Poets that ever wrote. For who can tell what is contain'd in the vast and boundless Womb of Possibility? This much I will adventure to affirm, that, laying aside Possibilities, which are known to God alone, the thing is in itself extremely improbable; and that *Johnston* is so far from being the Man, that he falls very far short, not only of *Virgil*, but all the other Authors you and I have named; nay, which is more, he is inferior in every Respect to *Buchanan*, (as I think I have already made out) whom yet neither he himself, nor any of his greatest Admirers, did ever pretend to be equal to any of them. All the Title his great Performances could procure him (and even that is a very high one) was, that he should be styl'd *Poetarum sui seculi facile Princeps*: But you, if the Esteem you have for *Johnston* is well founded, may, in the next Edition of his Paraphrase, superadd the most glorious *Elogium* that can be given him, of *Poetarum Latinorum omnis ævi* [or *omnium adhuc seculorum*] *Princeps*: The *facile* however I think may be omitted for *Virgil's* Sake; for tho' you make him equal in Majesty, and superior in a certain Nobleness of Verse in the Pentameter Line to that great Poet, yet as you own *Virgil* to have been his Instructor, it is not decent, that too high a Preference should be given to the Scholar above the Master. Tho' after all, as he was not the first that was wiser than his Teachers, and as he has received more Instruction from *Ovid* (whom you put so far below him) than from *Virgil*, *Horace*, or any other Poet, as I shall shew afterwards, you may, if all the rest is right, add *facile* or not, as you think proper.

It is very much, that in the same p. 44, you own, that even *Johnston* himself, whom you have represented elsewhere as so very perfect, has some Blemishes, or Faults, which you think yourself obliged to apologize for. "Perhaps, say you, it may be objected, that there is now and then a Word to be found, which is not in common Use; or a Quantity or two in 6000 Lines out of the vulgar way; or a Passage where the Author seems to play upon a Word: In this Case young People are to be told they must not imitate him in such Places. Is not this necessary even in *Virgil* himself? Are they not instructed that they must not begin an heroick Line with *Fluviorum* or *tenuis*? or leave one Vowel gaping against another, or make Use of double Rhimes, tho' *Virgil* has done it three or four times in twenty thousand Lines\*. Has not *Virgil* his *servataque serves*, and *agrescitque medendo*? And is not *Virgil* to be taught to Youth, because such Criticisms as these are to be made upon his wonderful Poems?" And then after you have taken Notice of some such in your other Favourite, *Milton*, you subjoin very justly, "The proper Reflexion to be made on these Inaccuracies, or Faults (if they should be called so) is, that tho' *Virgil*, *Milton* and *Johnston* so far surpass the rest of Mankind, yet they were but Men." This is most reasonable; but why have you not given the same Indulgence to *Buchanan*? Nay, why so far from it, that, on the contrary, you have stretched your Wits to the utmost, and used all Endeavours possible, by canvassing not only such things as above, but even Letters and Syllables in him to prove,

Q

if

\* The Number is too much magnified; for all the Verses or Lines in *Virgil's* considerable Works, viz. the *Pastorals*, *Georgicks* and *Aeneid* (which I suppose were these only you had in view) amount to no more than 12710, and if we take off the four prefatory Lines at the Beginning of the *Aeneid*, which are none of his, all *Virgil's* Lines in these his three great Works, are only in Number 12706. And had he received an *Aureus* (or 16 or 17 s.) for each of them from *Augustus*, as the Poet *Oppian* is said to have got from the Emperor *Marcus Antoninus Pius* for each of his, (tho' those of *Virgil's* were vastly more deserving) the Sum would not have been very great, as amounting only to about 10165 or 10800 l.



if we will believe you, that *ἔδεν ὕγιες*. nothing almost is right in him from the one End of his Version to the other. But I hope by this time I have shewn that the infinitely greater part of all your Criticisms, or rather Cavils, against him hitherto are pure Chimera's and Delusions: And these you are to add in your *Conclusion* I am pretty confident will have no better Success.

But you'll allow me to look back a little to these Inaccuracies or Faults which you say young People are to be told not to imitate in *Johnston* or *Virgil*. As 1. Words that are not in common Use: Of such I have remarked a few in *Johnston*, which tho' I will not absolutely condemn him for, yet I would agree with you in advising both young and old to forbear them. *Buchanan*, I'm sure, has none such. 2. A Quantity or two out of the vulgar Way: Of two of these I have taken Notice in *Johnston*, viz. *monocerotis* and *nycticoracis*, the one with the first Syllable, the other with the penult long. The former *Johnston* was aware of, and therefore changed it into *munocerotis*. The latter I am not fond of, and therefore could wish he had chosen some other Word; for that, *salvâ lege Pediâ*, cannot come into an *Hexameter* Line. As to *Buchanan*, I know not one Instance where he has done Violence to the Quantity, except in making the Penult in *salubri* short; in which I own he is by no means to be imitated. 3. As to *Johnston*'s playing upon a Word sometimes, the Fault is small, of itself, if it were not in Subjects very serious. 4. As to *Virgil*, what is blam'd in him, especially by your *Markland*, is of a different Nature from what you mention. For who dare give him, or any Poet of the *Augustan* Age, Laws with respect to the Quantity of Syllables, or *Ars metrica? Fluviorum*, I confess, is an unusual Word to begin an heroic Line with; but *Virgil*'s Example is, I think, sufficient to warrant it in a Poem of any considerable length; and much more *tenuis*, *tenuia*, *genua*, *ariete*, *arietat*, *abiete*, *parietibus*, &c. which may be used in any Poem; for which see *Erythræus*. 5. The double Rhimes in *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Propertius*, &c. are no Faults, nor would they be in a modern Poet, if they were only casual, as in them

them; and not affected, as they came to be afterwards in times of Barbarity: 6. As to the gaping of Vowels one against another, which your *Erythraeus* calls *Complosion*, others, as he tells us, tho' not so fitly, *boatus*; there are indeed many more of them in *Virgil* than any other *Latin* Poet, (*Erythraeus* reckons no fewer than forty two of them \*.) Of these that are in Words originally *Greek*, (of which there are a good many in him) and in Imitation of *Greek* Poets, I see nothing that hinders a modern Poet of Character from following his Example: As for those that occur in Words purely *Latin*, (tho' I dare not call it a Blemish in *Virgil*) yet, because very few that liv'd in that Age, or since, have taken that Freedom, I would not counsel any to imitate him. *Buchanan*, I think, and *Johnston* have no where done it. 7. As to *Servataque serves Troja fidem*, and *Agrescitque medendo*, I am so far from thinking either of them faulty, that, on the contrary, I think both very elegant and smart Ways of speaking.

I pass over the powerful Recommendations you again renew towards the End of your *Supplement*, in Favours of your darling Author, as not falling directly under my Design. Only I beg Leave to differ from you in one thing, viz. *That he has been in a manner lost to his own Country for almost a Century*. For it consists with my particular Knowledge, that long before your Edition came abroad, this and all that Author's other Works were had in high Esteem (as they justly deserved) by most Persons of Taste in polite Learning among us. As to what you add (and thereby insinuate, that while he was neglected at home, he was caress'd abroad) of his *being for forty or fifty Years past taught in many Schools abroad*, (as, you say, *you have been credibly informed*) I very much doubt, if it is strictly true. Had it been so, we should probably have had many more Editions of him: For it is hardly to be thought that the small *Middleburg Edition, Anno 1642*,

Q 2

CF

\* There is one of these ought not to have come into the Number, viz.

*Te Corydon, O Alexi, trahit sua quemque voluptas.* |  
For the Interjection *O* is never slid by any Poet.

or that at *Amsterdam*, Anno 1706 (for I never heard of, nor do you mention any other but those two, printed beyond Seas) would have suffic'd for that Purpose. I am afraid that what you say further, " that he is *there* (i. e. " *abroad*) look'd upon as one of the first Books that is to be " taken up, and the last ever to be laid down: And that " here is *Milk for Babes, and strong Meat for them that " are of full Age*, was only meant of the *Divine Original*, and not of *Johnston's* or any other Paraphrase whatsoever. In this Sense I take (and I would not easily take them in any other) the Words of Mr. *Hoogstratan*, which your Fondness for *Johnston* has made you apply to him: *Disce ergo hinc cum fructu tibi viam munire ad veram virtutem, quæ non alibi rectius veris coloribus depingitur, quàm in his hymnis. Hos, si sapias, nunquam de manibus depones.* This is too much to be said of *Johnston's* Version of them, and looks like *cælum ipsum petere stultitiâ*, (as *Horace* expresses it) and not only to exalt him above *Buchanan*, but also to attribute to him *Divine Honours*: Both which were very remote from his Thought, and I believe also from Mr. *Hoogstratan's*; who in the very Beginning of the Preface to his Edition of *Johnston's* Psalms, tho' otherwise he highly extols him, yet gives *Buchanan* the Preference, in these Words, *Arcturi Johnstoni, Medici Regii in Scotia, quo, meâ sententiâ, in istis oris, nemo POST BUCHANANUM, facundissimum virum, melius, tersius aut concinnius scripsit, Psalmos Davidicos reduco in lucem.* As to his Words *reduco in lucem*, I understand nothing more by them, but that he was giving out a new Edition of the Psalms, at the Distance of upwards of sixty Years after the last of the two former ones, which were become by that time somewhat scarce abroad. But that all his Works, except the *Canticum*, were in the Hands of many, and well known in *Scotland* before that Time, I myself signified in the Preface to the Edition I published of the *Canticum* in the 1709, in these Words, *Omni bus paullò humanioribus, quibus satis nota sunt alia Johnstoni poemata, &c.* long before this invidious Comparifon between him and *Buchanan* was broached, or so much as dream'd of. I pass over the o-

ther



ther fulsom and over-strain'd Encomiums you give to the Doctor, with which you conclude this Piece. Let his Fame be rais'd as high as you please, provided it is not at the Expence of that of *Buchanan*; I shall be so far from lessening it, that I shall join with you, in wishing him the same good Fortune, that was wish'd to and obtain'd by a greater Poet than either of them, the immortal *Virgil*,

*Laudetur, vigeat, placeat, relegatur, ametur.*

To this your Supplement I find subjoyn'd some Observations made by the *Authors of the Universal History*, wherein they give out that they have made it appear, that *Johnston*, besides the other *inimitable Beauties* (as they call them) of his Version, has shew'd himself a *thorough Master of the Hebrew Tongue*. Tho' it may seem incongruous in me, who do not pretend to any Skill in that Language, to disagree with what is advanced by those learned Gentlemen; yet I hope it shall not much offend either you or them, if I tell here what are my real Sentiments in that Matter. And these in short are, that I do not believe that either *Buchanan* or *Johnston* were much vers'd in that kind of Learning. The Nature of their Studies and Professions, as well as of their Temper and Genius, seem to have turn'd their Heads another Way, and to have left them very little Room for applying their Minds to that sort of Knowledge, which to Men of their Taste appears *dry* and *jejune*, not to say *dark* and *mysterious*. It is therefore to be presum'd of them, that when they set about their several Versions, they did not much employ their Thoughts in a nice and critical Disquisition concerning the inward and peculiar Signification of every Word of the *Original*, as these Gentlemen pretend *Johnston* has done; but rather that they took Things as they found them, in the several *Greek*, *Latin*, and other *Translations* and the various *Notes* and *Commentaries* of Men suppos'd to be well skill'd in that Language; and that by consulting and comparing them together, they in their Paraphrases chose that Sense, which to them seem'd most agreeable to the general Scope and Intendment of

the sacred Authors. As to *Buchanan*, it is commonly thought that he was chiefly directed by the Translations and Commentaries of *Franc. Vatablus*, Professor of that Language in the University of *Paris*, and then reckoned a Person of extraordinary Abilities in that kind of Learning. As to *Johnston*, it is not easy to determine who were his chief Guides in his Paraphrase. Only this I may venture to say, that for the most Part he seems to have gone no farther than the *Latin* Translations then extant, but especially the *English* one now in use among us. In many Places he follows *Buchanan*, and that sometimes, where he seems to have mis'd the Sense of the Original. But you'll ask how I come to talk so, who own myself ignorant of that Language. I answer, that I have done as I suppose they did: That is, I have, when I saw Occasion for it, consulted the best *Criticks* I could find, namely *Grotius*, *Hammond*, *Patrick* and *Wells*, and sometimes *Dr. Hare*, all of them Persons of singular Learning, and most of them led to that Study by their Profession. Which Method you in your Preface own yourself also to have taken. It is from such Lights as these, that I have discovered (and so might you too, if you had not thought fit to dissemble it) several Mistakes in *Johnston* with Respect to the true Sense of the *Original*, and met perhaps with severals of the same kind in *Buchanan*. But as those their Errors are nowise gross, or in the least inconsistent with the chief Design of the *Psalmist's* Words, no judicious Reader ought to take great Exception at them.

If these Things I have said are true, as I think I have good Ground to believe they are; then these learned Gentlemen will pardon me to add, that that deep Skill they attribute to *Dr. Johnston* in this his Performance, of penetrating into the critical Meaning of the primary or radical Words of the *Original*, appears to me in a great Measure fanciful and imaginary. What inclines me farther to be of this Opinion, is that a certain Gentleman of good Learning, and particularly in the *Hebrew* Language, has lately endeavoured to shew the same Knowledge of those *Hebrew* Roots in *Buchanan*, and which is more, disproves and rejects several of those brought by these

These Authors with Respect to *Johnston*. The justest Inference I can therefore make of these Gentlemens thus clashing and interfering with one another, is that on both Sides they have too much indulged their Fancy, and that neither *Buchanan* nor *Johnston* were possess'd of, nor troubled their Heads about that Piece of Knowledge they attribute to them.

I may add here, as a further Confirmation of what I hinted at a little above, that neither *Buchanan* nor *Johnston's* Skill in the original Language seem to have been extraordinary, that both the one and the other, especially the latter, have sometimes quite mistaken its Sense, and often applied it otherwise than was primarily intended. And this I am to do, not from any Knowledge I myself have in that Language, which I have all along own'd to be none; but upon the Judgment and Authority of the best Commentators I could find on that sacred Book.

The Instances I shall bring are these following.

*Examples where Johnston, and sometimes Buchanan, have mistaken or misapplied the Words of the Original.*

xxxiv. 5. *Vir pius hunc spectans accurret, & obvius ulnis Excipiet.*] 'Tis plain that by *hunc* here in *Johnston*, must be understood the good Man, or *David*, (the suppliance, as the Annotator explains it) mentioned in the preceding Verse. Whereas most of the Commentators I am acquainted with, interpret, *They looked on him*, in Orig. to be Almighty God. *Buchanan* right.

18. *Deus huic præsto est, vitæ quem turpiter actæ Penitet,*] Here the Author takes the Words, *The Lord is nigh to them that are of a broken Heart*, for such as are heartily grieved and truly penitent for their past Sins; whereas the best Commentators understand them of those, who being truly pious and upright, yet have their Hearts almost broken with Afflictions. [See *Vatablus*, *Patrick* and *Wells.*]



*Wells.*] And thus *Buchanan*, *Afflicta cum molestiis Succumbit oneri mens.*

xxxvi. 2. — *dum tandem nequiter acta Pœniteat vite displiceatque sibi.*] There is nothing of those Sinners Repentance, or their being displeas'd with themselves for their evil Deeds. So *Johnston* has it *gens impia*, as of many: Whereas the Psalmist *David* is speaking of one Person only, probably *Saul*, who tho' he might be ashamed, yet it does not appear that he was heartily sorry for his persecuting *David*. The *Orig.* has it, *He flattereth himself in his own Eyes, until his Iniquity be found to be hateful.* *Buchanan* right. See *Dr. Patrick*, as also what I have remarked, p. 38. on *Ps.* i. of this Psalm.

i. 5. — *juvencis Fœdera quam mecum pacta litare jubent.*] The Sense of which is; *Who by the Covenant entred into betwixt me and them, are bound to appease me by the Sacrifice of Bullocks:* Whereas *Orig.* has it, *That have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice, i. e.* "Who have engaged themselves in a solemn Covenant, confirmed by the Blood of Sacrifices, that I should be their God, and consequently that they should obey not only my Ordinances concerning Sacrifices, but also all my other Laws and Commandments." See *Drs. Patrick* and *Wells*.\*

lii. i. *Turba potens.*] Why *turba*? When the *Orig.* and all the Translations I have read, speak only of one Person, and that the Title of the Psalm shews to have been *Doeg the Edomite.* *Buchanan* here right.

lxi. 5. — *piisque Debitus heredis jam mihi cessit bonus.*]

---

\**Sim. de Muis* in his excellent Commentary on the *Psalms*, (tho' he owns that *Rabbi Rasi* explains the Words [*corete beriti gnale zabach*] *Peritientes fœdus mecum super sacrificio*, in the Sense above-mentioned, yet he) following *Rabbi Ezra*, and, as it would seem, *Varabius*, expounds them, *de rebus ad sacrificia pertinentibus.* And it is in this Sense that *Buchanan*, and after him *Johnston*, take that Phrase; which I am the more surpriz'd at, that all of them could not but know, that it was an universally received Custom, both with the *Israelites* and Heathen Nations, of ratifying their Covenants by the Sacrifice of some Animal, according to that of *Virgil*,

— *casâ jungebant fœdera porcâ,*

I do not well understand this; but am pretty sure it does not express the Sense of the *Orig.* *Thou hast given me the Heritage of those that fear thy Name, i. e.* as the best Commentators explain it, "Thou hast given me the Possession of that Country, which is the Inheritance of thy faithful People. [So Dr. Patrick.] of all the Land of *Israel.* [So Dr. Wells.]" Buchanan right, *Frenare sceptris te metuentium Hereditatem das mihi.*

lxii. 3. — *ut ariete pulsa Mœnia.*] I know not whether battering Rams were in use among the *Israelites.* But whatever is in that, there is no Intimation in the *Orig.* [*a bowing Wall*] as of a Wall, to the overthrowing of which any Violence or Force was used. The Commentators explain it of a *Wall that is not evenly built*; and which of course, in a short time, would fall of itself. Buchanan has rightly rendred it, *Proni in ruinam incumbitis ceu mœnia Saxis solutis putria*; which last Words Johnston has imitated in the pentameter Line, — *vel putri saxa soluta situ.*

lxxiii. 10. *Hæc spectans huc vertit iter, sua castra relinquens, Vir pius, irati quem rapit unda freti.*] The Meaning of this, so far as I can understand it, is in short this. *The pious Man seeing these Things, being carried away as it were by an impetuous Tide, changes his Course of Piety and joins with the wicked in their ungodly Practices.* This is a Thought both harsh in itself, and countenanced by none of the Commentators that I know of, though otherwise differing among themselves. Dr. Hammond and Wells Interpretation of the *Orig.* [*Therefore his People return hither, and Waters of a full Cup are wrung out to them*] is, "Therefore God's People have frequent Occasion given them, to entertain their Thoughts with such Meditations as I do now mine; and are frequently induced to vent their Grief by Plenty of Tears." Buchanan is much to the same Purpose. *Hæc mente spectant attonitâ pii, Et æstuante pectore fluctuant.*

lxxiv. 5. *Claruit hic olim, qui, cæsis undique silvis, Intulit arboreas in tua tecta trabes.*] i. e. as I take it. *He was most famous, who was most active in cutting down Trees in the Woods for the Building of the Temple.* And so

so *Vatablus* seems to understand the Words: But *Hammond*, *Patrick* and *Wells* explain it quite otherwise, viz. "That he was most taken Notice of among them, who was most active in destroying the Temple, as if he were cutting down the Boughs of thick Trees in a Forest." To whom *Buchanan* comes pretty near: *Bacchatur audax irâ fremens liberâ; Ædis ruentis it fragor, Quales sub altis murmurant quercus jugis, Cæsæ bipenni cum ruunt.*

20. *Nequicquam quærimus umbras, sciz. hostilis, &c.*] Orig. The dark Places of the Earth are full of the Habitations of Cruelty. i. e. according to the best Commentators, "The Land of Canaan is so far from being inhabited by thy People, that every blind or dark Corner of it is a Den of Thieves and Murderers."\* *Johnston's* Words are far from that Sense: It is to no Purpose for us to seek for dark Places to shelter us, for these are possessed by cruel Enemies. *Buchanan* here is also wrong.

lxxvi. 4. *Tu, Deus, immanes superas virtute leones.*] Orig. Thou art more glorious and excellent than the Mountains of Prey: Or as the old Translation, Thou art of more Honour and Might than the Hills of the Robbers. *David Kimchi*, as is noted by *Sim. de Muis*, is the only Interpreter that I find who takes the Words in that Sense. *Vatablus* indeed mentions Lions, as the Opinion of some: But is of another himself. *Dr. Patrick* and *Wells* apply this to *Sion*, and not to God himself. *Dr. Hammond* indeed explains it, Thy Presence, O God, in this Hill of *Sion*. Again *Dr. Wells* interprets the Mountains of Prey, of the Enemies who placed themselves there to carry on their Sieges against our Cities or fortified Towns; and so does *Dr. Hammond*. *Dr. Patrick* explains it either of the Mountains where the fiercest Beasts of Prey, or the most desperate Robbers have their Resort. *Buchanan* applies the first Part of the Verse to Almighty God; but the second

\* *De Muis* takes the Words in the same Sense, only he explains the dark Places of the Earth, of the Country whither they were carried captive, *Per loca tenebrosa terra*, says he, *intelligit illam terram in qua Israelita exules agebant, quippe qua illis nihil nisi tenebras & calamitates fondebat.*



cond to powerful Enemies, and thereby agrees with Hammond and Wells, as also with Tate and Brady.

lxxviii. 57. *Cornibus adductis, &c.*] Johnston here makes the Comparison to a deceitful Bow to consist in its returning to its former Shape, when the Bent of it is taken off. Whereas most Commentators apply it to an ill made Bow that never sends the Arrow to the right Mark. Buchanan is in the same Mistake, if it is one, with Johnston.

lxxx. 17. *Tu tibi selectos ultrici protege dextrâ.*] Orig. Let thy Hand be upon the Man of thy right Hand, upon the Son of Man, whom thou madest strong for thyself, i. e. (say most Interpreters) our King, viz. Hezekiah, whom Dr. Patrick has shewn to be here particularly meant, and not God's chosen People in general †. Buchanan here, I think, is right: *Hunc, vires & opes & decus antea Affectu patrio cui cumulaveris.* Tule refers this *hunc* to *ramum*, eleven Lines before. But I rather take it δεικτικῶς this excellent Prince, *virum dexterae tuae, cui vires, &c.* But either Way it comes to the same Purpose.

lxxxii. 5. *Hos ultrix scelerum—tellus obruet.*] This quite beside the Meaning of the Orig. All the Foundations of the Earth are out of Course. i. e. "The Foundations of a Kingdom, which are Justice and Truth, are shaken, all Things are in Confusion, and in Danger to come to utter Ruin," as Dr. Patrick (with whom Vatablus and other Interpreters agree) explains it. Buchanan right and elegant: *Ut neque Compaginem rerum solutam Justitiâ pereunte cernant.*

lxxxiii. 3. —*utque pios sola caligine tutos Opprimat.*] This pretty remote from Orig. They have consulted against thy hidden ones. i. e. according to Patrick (with whom other Commentators in the main agree) "Against thy People whom thou hast hitherto protected as thy Jewels; or against thy Temple, and so the secret or most holy Place where thou dwellest." Buchanan right.

lxxxv.

† Vatablus, but, I think, without Foundation, takes it indeed in that sense: *De toto populo, says he, loquitur, quasi de uno homine,*

lxxxv. 1. *Tu Deus Isacidum ditasti messibus arva, Te duce Niliaci liquimus antra soli.*] Orig. O Lord, thou hast been favourable to thy Land, thou hast brought back the Captivity of Jacob. Some apply this to David's happy Restoration after the Rebellion of his Son *Absalom*; others to the miraculous Deliverance the Jews had from *Senacherib's* Army. But *Amama*, de *Muis*, *Vatablus*, *Hammond*, *Patrick* and *Wells* think that it chiefly relates to their Return from the *Babylomish* Captivity. But no one, that I know of, refers it, as *Johnston* does, to a plentiful Harvest they enjoy'd after a great Famine, as he does in the first Verse; and far less to their Deliverance from the *Egyptian* Bondage, as in the second. *Buchanan* has judiciously kept in the general with the Orig. Mr. *Lauder*, I know, finds Fault with him, for not preserving the Distinction between the Land of *Judea*, as in the first Clause of the Text, and the *Inhabitants* of it, as in the second. But this Criticism is in my Opinion groundless. For I take it, that Land and People are here much the same thing, there being no Metonymy more frequent than to name a Country for the *Inhabitants* of it. For what else signifies, *Thou hast been favourable to thy Land*, or *Benedixisti terræ tuæ* as in the Vulgate, but *thou hast restored thy People to their own Land, in which thou thyself hast chosen to dwell*? It is thus I am sure that Dr. *Patrick* explains this Passage.

lxxxix. 6. — *secundum Quem tibi purpureo de grege terra dabit.* Orig. Who is he among the mighty that can be likened unto the Lord? or, as the old Translation has it: What is he among the Gods that shall be like unto the Lord? By which the Generality of Interpreters understand *Angels*, *hebene Elohim*, in *filiis Deorum*: But by *Johnston's* *purpureo grege* can be signified only *Kings* and *Princes*; which none speak of, but he and *Buchanan*.

xc. 14. *Sceptra ferenda dabo.*] i. e. I will make him a King. This too much, for, I will set him on high. i. e. as Dr. *Patrick* explains it, I will set him above the Reach of all future Danger. But, if this Psalm was composed by King *David* with Reference to the Plague sent for his numbering the People, as is thought by the best Commentators,

\* P  
But th  
but onl  
I doub  
this I l

mentators, then it cannot be said that God would make him a *King*: For that he then was, and had been many Years before. *Buchanan* right.

xcv. ult—*nec sacræ tecta Sionis.*] This is quite beside the Text: *To whom I swear in my Wrath, that they should not enter into my Rest. i. e.* "That that Generation, which had so heinously offended me, should wander all their Days, and at last die in the Wilderness, and never enter into that good Land, where I intended to give them Rest after all their Travels." This is the true Meaning of the Place. I know the Apostle *Heb.* iii, 11. gives it a spiritual Meaning: But that was not to be done here, where nothing but a close and plain Version was designed. But whether we take the *sacræ tecta Sionis* in a literal or typical Sense, *i. e.* either for the Temple of God at Jerusalem, or the Happiness of the Blessed in Heaven, it is attended with a great Impropriety. For in the former it would be incongruous to bring in God as swearing that that Generation should not see a Place, which was not to be built till upwards of 400 Years after, when they by the Course of Nature should be long before dead. In the latter Sense it should signify, that God swear that none of them should go to Heaven, but be eternally miserable: Which is contrary to all Charity to imagine.

cv. 29. *Indigentum tepido manârunt sanguine rivi.*] If we interpret this, as your Annotator does, *Amnes fluxerunt calido cruore incolarum*, nothing can be more false. For this Miracle, or first Egyptian Plague, consisted only in turning the Water itself into Blood, whereby the Fish that were in it died. But there is not the least Insinuation that any of the Inhabitants of Egypt died with it, far less that the Water flowed with their Blood. There are other two Constructions may be put on this Passage; but hardly either of them tolerable. 1<sup>st</sup>, *Rivi manârunt\* tep. sang.*

\* Perhaps it is in this Sense your Interpretation is to be understood: But there is nothing intimated concerning the Blood of the Fishes, but only of the Water that was metamorphosed into Blood. Besides, I doubt if it is proper to call the Blood of Fishes *tepidus* or warm. But this I leave to Naturalists to determine.



*sang. indigenum. i. e. piscium in iis habitantium.* But that would signify that the Fishes had their Blood shed in the Water, and not that the Water itself was turned into Blood, which by its becoming putrid slew them. 2dly, *Rivi indigenum. i. e. Ægyptiorum, manarunt tepido sanguine,* or the Rivers of the Inhabitants of Egypt, for the Rivers of Egypt. But this, tho' I believe it is *Johnston's* true Meaning, is in itself something aukward: Especially as it would naturally signify that their Blood was mingled with the Water; at least that the Water turned into Blood was warm; which we have no Reason to think.

cix. i. *Qui mihi regali cingis diademate frontem.*] Orig. O God of my Praise. Interpreters, especially *Hammond*, take Notice that the Words, *of my Praise*, may be taken two Ways, either with Respect to God, or with Respect to King *David*. In the first Sense it signifies: *Who art the Subject of my Praises, Whom I am bound continually to magnify for thy Goodness towards me.* In the 2d Sense it means, *Who art the Author of all the Mercies I have received, or of that Honour and Respect I have from Men.* In the 2d Sense (tho' most probably not the true one) *Johnston* has taken it: But whether intended by the *Psalmist* or not, he has carried the matter beyond all Bounds. For if (as most Commentators agree) this Psalm was composed by *David*, and the direful Imprecations contain'd in it are directed against *Doeg the Edomite*,\* who was his most cruel Enemy, it must have been written long before *David* was King, and consequently the *regali cingis diademate frontem*, is quite out of Purpose. *Buchanan* has, *mea gloria*, which is according to the *Syriack* Version, O God of my Glory. i. e. says *Hammond*, of my Singing, my Rejoicing, in whom I glory: Or, in quo glorior, as *de Muis* has it.

cix. 6. — *geniis feris.*] *Buchanan* *Vastator Angelus.* Orig. Satan. But most Commentators explain it, not of the Devil, but some malicious Adversary or Accuser, which

\* And prophetically against *Judas Iscariot* the Traitor, *Mat. i. 26.*

which the original Word *Vesatan* will bear. See *Hammond* and others.

cxviii. 24. *Lux fuit hæc felix divini conscia partûs, &c.*] Orig. *This is the Day, which the Lord hath made.* This *Psalms* is supposed by most Commentators to have been composed by King *David* sometime after he had brought the Ark to *Jerusalem* and had subdued the *Philistines* and other Enemies round about. It contains also a Prophecy concerning *Jesus Christ*, of whom *David* was an eminent Type. But why should *Johnston* have here omitted the literal Sense, and minded only the figurative or mystical? But that is not all, why does he apply it to our Blessed Saviour's *Birth* or *Incarnation*, when *St. Peter*, *Acts* iv. 11. and all Commentators, explain it of his glorious *Resurrection* and *Ascension*? I am afraid that these Lines of *Martial* on *Lucan's* Birthday, *Epig.* vii. 21. has been running too much in his Head,

*Hæc est illa dies, quæ sacri conscia partûs,  
Lucanum populis & tibi, Polla, dedit.*

cxix. 52. *Hanc olim meditans puer.*] Orig. *I remembered thy Judgments of old:* which is not, that *I remembered or meditated on them when I was young:* But, *I remembered thy Dealings with good Men in former Ages.*

61. *Compede me vinxit gens impia.*] Orig. *Bands* [i. e. *Companies*, as in the Margin] of wicked Men have robbed me. The vulgate indeed has *Funes peccatorum*, which has misled *Buchanan*, who has *Impeditus impiorum vinculis*, as he has done *Johnston*. But *Vatablus* renders the Word *catervæ, cœtus, turmæ*, whom most of my Commentators follow.

cxxv. 3. *Ne pius exemplo peccet.*] Orig. *Lest the righteous put forth their Hands to Iniquity.* Nothing of bad Example here exprest or probably intended: But only "Lest the righteous, having their Patience tired out, should be tempted to use unlawful Means for their Deliverance." *Hammond* indeed speaks of Example: But *Patrick, Wells*, and others take the Words in the Sense I have mentioned, and so seems *Buchanan*, and am sure *Tate* and *Brady*.

cxlvi. 3. *Regum sceptris ne crede salutem, Aut homini,*  
nil

*nil rex, nil homo præstet opis*] This *homini* and *homo* come here but bluntly in, and is what you would call an *Anticlimax*. See above p. 14. and 201. *Orig. Son of Man*, by which Interpreters understand not any ordinary *Man*, or *Man* in general, but *Princes* and the greatest of *Men*. Thus *Pf. viii. 4. What is Man that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest him?* i. e. *What is Man, or even the greatest Prince in the World?* See Dr. *Patrick's* Preface to his Paraphrase.

To these may also be added such Passages in the *Psalms*, which though in their literal and most natural Meaning they relate to the temporal Happiness or Misery of Persons in this World; yet *Johnston* applies to their future and eternal State in the World to come. As,

xviii. 46. —*æternum vivere posse dedit*. See above p. 14.

xxvii. 13. —*ventura gaudia vite*.

xxxiii. 12. —*cali scribetur & heres*.

cxl. 10. *Quicquid & indomiti Tartarus ignis habet*.

And some other such like: Which, tho' in their mystical and spiritual Signification they may have a Reference to *Mens* future and unchangeable Condition in the other Life; yet in a Paraphrase, especially so concise an one as that of Dr. *Johnston*, the literal Sense ought not to have been neglected, and the spiritual put in its Place. This *Buchanan* has carefully avoided in the Instances above-mentioned, and elsewhere also, so far as I can remember. And 'tis remarkable, that whereas in the first Editions of his *Psalms*, in the xv. 1. he had rendered it, *Stellata cali templa quis incolet*, he afterwards judiciously changed it, according to the Letter, into, *Sancta Sionis templa quis incolet*, &c.

### S E C T. III.

I Have now done with your *Prefat. Discourse* and *Supplement*: But find my Task is far from being finished. One would indeed have thought that in these two Treatises, you had said enough, and more than enough, to the Commendation of your darling Author, and to the Disparagement



paragement of *Buchanan*: Yet as if that had not been sufficient, like fond Lovers, that can think or speak of nothing but their beloved Mistresses, and Hatefulness of their Rivals, you bring both Authors again upon the Field, by tacking to your *Supplement* a new Piece, which you call *the Conclusion*, &c. This you usher in with telling the World, "That tho' many Persons own themselves "to be convinced (by what has been already said) that "Dr. *Johnston's* Translation excels *Buchanan's*; yet "there are still those (*whom, it seems, your Prefatory Discourse and Supplement, have not been able entirely to de- vest of their old Prejudices,*) who contend that some of "*Buchanan's* Psalms claim the Superiority, especially "the 1st and 104th——*Nay* they go so far as to say—— "that picking out a Line or two, especially in the 104th "Psalm [*which you have done Suppl. p. 40 and 41, and thought sufficient to convince them of Buchanan's Failures, and his Inferiority to Johnston, in that as well as other Parts of the Work*] will not give the Preference to *John-* "ston as to the whole of that inimitable Performance, "as they [*ignorantly*] stile it. *And if they should be beaten from that Hold,* they [*foolishly*] imagine that the im- "mortal Epigram [*as they fancy it*] must stand for ever "unrival'd by *Johnston*. To redress these Errors, *you tell us,* that you readily undertake the Labour of com- "paring *Johnston* and *Buchanan* together Verse by Verse, "as to the two Psalms above-mentioned. As to the "boasted Epigram addressed to the *Caledonian Nymph,* "you have another Nymph of the same Country to be "produced on *Johnston's* Side, which will absolutely "eclipse all the Charms of the former."

This is gloriously undertaken, and, if big Words will do it, is enough to frighten any Man from entering the Lists with you: But as I have entered upon the Combat, and have hitherto come off, I think, with pretty good Success, I have the less Reason to be afraid to enter upon this second Engagement. Nor am I in the least discouraged by the mighty Feats you boast of, *viz. that many Persons own themselves to be convinced, (by what you have said already) that Dr. Johnston's Translation excels Bu-*

R

chanan's

chanan's; as you here affirm, in the Beginning of this your additional Treatise. You have not thought fit to give us any of the Names of those many Persons you pretend to have convinced, and it is much to their Credit, that you have conceal'd them. For by what I have said already, I think I may assert in my Turn, that their Conviction is very ill founded, and of Consequence that their Judgment in this Affair, be they many or few, is very little to be regarded. But before I come to this new Encounter, I must tell you once for all, that what you make the third Branch in the Comparison' viz. *the Arts of Verse*, I am almost quite to neglect, having sufficiently vindicated *Buchanan* on that Head already against all that you, or any one else, can say against him. I shall therefore generally confine myself to your two other Branches of the Comparison, viz. that which respects, 1st, *The Translation*: 2dly, *The Language or Stile*.

### *Buchanan and Johnston's Paraphrases of the 1st Psalm compared.*

TO proceed then with *Buchanan's* 1st Psalm, (1.) You tell us, of the very first Words *Felix ille animi* (for nothing is to escape you) "That it is no easy Matter to fix any plain Sense on this figurative Expression, which is borrowed from *Angelus Politianus*." What! because we have here a Grammatical Figure called an *Hellenism*, or *Greek Way of Speaking*, which is very common, as well as beautiful, with Poets, *Felix animi* for *Felix in animo est*, or *Habet felicem animum*; is it therefore a difficult Matter to fix any plain Sense upon the Expression? If Figures render the Sense obscure and hard to be understood, what then becomes of *Calmet's* Complaint mentioned by you above, *Préf. Disc. p. 56.* and what you there say of your Author, "That though other Translators have not taken Care to insert the numerous Figures in the Original, yet *Johnston* has doubled the Number in his Translation?" And is not the Bulk of

of y  
plain  
the  
scu  
qua  
whe  
few  
men  
Exi  
mi,  
Pra  
men  
Anx  
Fals  
Terr  
Purp  
Virg  
that  
whic  
ther  
ille,  
But  
have  
neve  
sext  
Fing  
Crow  
And  
of th  
whic  
whic  
said  
such  
sion,  
yet a

\* E  
nacer d  
18. 7  
Gatica

of your Notes upon him taken up in pointing out and explaining those Figures? But it may perhaps be said, that the particular Figure here has a more than ordinary Obscurity in it. But who will say so, that is in the least acquainted with *Latin* or *Greek* Poetry? for they every where abound with it. Of the *Latin*, I shall mention a few, where this very Word *animi* is so construed, as *A-mens animi*, *Audax animi*, *Dubius animi*, *Egregius animi*, *Exiguus animi*, *Fessus animi*, *Furens animi*, *Fidens animi*, *Fortunatus animi*, *Integer animi*, *Modicus animi*, *Præstans animi*, *Turbatus animi*, *Vagus animi*. Not to mention the same way of speaking in Prose Writers, as *Anxius animi*, *Atrox animi*, *Cæcus animi*, *Certus animi*, *Falsus animi*, *Ferox animi*, *Letus animi*, *Suspensus animi*, *Territus animi*, &c\*. And, which comes closer to our Purpose, *Felix animi* in *Juvenal*, and *Infelix animi* in *Virgil*. So that you have little or no Reason for saying, that *Buchanan* had borrowed the Phrase from *Politian*, which you see good classical Authors had used before either of them, unless it be on the Account of the Word *ille*, in which *Buchanan* and *Politian* happen to agree. But otherwise, as to the Word *ille*, there could nothing have been better chosen in this Place, tho' *Buchanan* had never seen *Politian*. For the Word here is to be taken *δευτικῶς*, as if this happy Man was pointed at with the Finger, and singled out, as it were, from among a vast Crowd of wicked and consequently unhappy Mortals. And there is a new Beauty added to it, by the Repetition of the *ille* in the 3d Verse, *Ille velut rigua*, &c. All which are lost in *Johnston*. But to return to the Figure, which is so common with Poets and others; it may be said of him, who has any Difficulty in understanding such Passages, what *Lipsius* said of one, on a like Occasion, That *ne linguae quidem Latinae colorem novit*. And yet after all the Obscurity you find in that Phrase in *Buchanan*,

R 2

chanan,

---

\* Examples of these see in *Despauter's* large Grammar. p. 236. *Linaer de emen. struct. Lat. serm.* p. 178. *Vichneri Hellenolexia* lib. I. cap. 18. *Johnston's* not. *Nottingamica* p. 16. &c. and very fully in my *Grammatica major*, p. 71 & seqq.



*Buchanan*, you immediately tell us " That the Meaning of these *same* Words in *Politian* is, that *He has made a wise Choice*, or *He is happy in his own-Mind*; and thus they must be understood in the Psalm before us: Tho' this Sense falls very short of the Original, which implies all kind of Happiness both in this World and in the next." You have at last, for as uneasy a Matter as at first it appeared, hit upon the Meaning of the Words *Felix ille animi*, which is, That *He is happy in his Mind*. You have added the Word *OWN*, on Purpose, I'm afraid, to deceive your Readers, as if *Buchanan's* Meaning was, That *he was happy in his OWN CONCEIT*: most Fools being possess'd of such a Happiness. But *Buchanan's* true Meaning is, that he is such a one as is solidly happy, by following the Dictates of his Mind or Understanding, i. e. by doing such Things as his best Reason teaches him to be the only way to true Happiness; or as you yourself worded it at first, *He has made a wise Choice*. Does not all Happiness consist in the *Mind*? Did ever Mortal call a magnificent Palace, Heaps of Silver and Gold, fine Apparel, delicious Meats, &c. happy? Why? because these Things have not a *MIND* to perceive it? And can there be any Happiness that is not felt? But the Happiness mentioned in the *Orig.* is a Happiness (you say) respects both this World and the next: And can he be said to be truly happy in *Mind*, or to have made a wise Choice that does not regard Futurity? You are here all along fighting with your own Shadow, and not with *Buchanan*. Tho' after all, it is to be considered, that the *Psalmist* seems to be speaking of a present not a future Happiness. He does not say *He shall be happy*, but *He presently is happy*. Happy in the Satisfaction he has in his *Mind*, resulting from the Pleasure that he presently enjoys, from the Consciousness of his steady Course in the Paths of Virtue and Religion: Happy in the Sense he has of the natural Tendency that the Practice of Sobriety, Righteousness and Piety hath to promote his temporal Welfare; and no Doubt also presently happy from the joyful Prospect he constantly entertains in his *Mind* of receiving a due Recompence in the other World. But

\* I know that other English H

it is some what diverting, that, when you compare our two Authors, you tell us that *Johnston's* bare Word *Felix* has a great deal more in it, as if *Buchanan's* adding the Word *animi* to it had spoil'd all. Here you say "That in this one Word *Felix*, we have all the *Latin* Language can furnish.\* This implies, *He is happy indeed, happy in all Respects.* *Johnston* does not confine the Happiness to the Mind or the Body, to this World or the next, but leaves the Reader to what he will find in the Sequel of the Discourse." And is all this lost by the *unhappy* Addition of the Word *animi*? As if Happiness left off to be Happiness, if you but mention the Seat of it, and wherein only it can reside and dwell. This is very strange Language, and spoken by a Figure, of which we have no Example either in *Johnston* or *Buchanan*. It is commonly call'd *Gibberish* or *Jargon*, and some would not stand to give it the Appellation of *Nonsense*. As to what you add, "That *Johnston* does not confine the Happiness to the Mind or Body, to this World or the next, but leaves the Reader to what he will find in the Sequel of the Discourse." Is not this equally true in *Buchanan*, who says, That *the Man is happy in his Mind*, i. e. *makes a truly wise and rational Choice*, who does what we are told in the Sequel of the *Psalms*? And here, while we are speaking of the Word, which we render *BLESSED*, and both *Buchanan* and *Johnston Felix*, I cannot omit to observe that the *Original* one *Ashre* is by some reckoned an *Adjective*, by some a *Substantive*, and by some an *Adverb*: Which last is the Opinion of *Le Clerc*, as the second is of *Dr. Hare*, who has this judicious Remark upon it: *Dolet perfectè auspiciatissime vocis formam non penitus intelligi: quod unicum manifestò nimis indicio est tenuem admodum et exilem esse, quæ jam superest Heb. linguæ cognitionem.* And this by the by may serve much to abate the Boastings that you and the Authors of the *universal History* make of the extraordinary

\* I know no peculiar Significancy in the Word *Felix*, more than in that other *Latin* Word *Beatus*, or in the *Greek* *μακάριος*, or in the *English* *Happy* or *Blessed*, &c.

dinary Knowledge that *Johnston* had of that Language, of which we have taken Notice above.

After you have show'd, as you fancy, the Difficulty of understanding, and, when understood, the Impropriety of *Felix ille animi*, in *Buchanan*, you next endeavour to expose his whole 1st Paragraph or four Lines :

—*quem non de tramite recto*, &c. to

—*dedit irrisoribus aurem*.

Where you begin with telling us, what is indeed true, "That learned Writers have observed, that the Royal Poet in this Place describes the Gradation of unhappy Persons from one Degree of Offence to another. The Progress is from hearkening to bad Advice, to walking or continuing in evil Ways, and from thence to the very scorning or ridiculing of Virtue, which is the *Ne plus ultra* of Impiety." All right: but then you add "That *Buchanan* inverts all this Order, and absurdly mentions in the first Place the vile Wretches being polluted with Impiety, and even Sacrilege; and then speaks of an erroneous Way, and giving too easy an Ear to the Revilers of Religion." And you conclude with saying, "that nothing can be worse than this Translation." But all this, as I shall shew you, is a gross Mistake. For *Buchanan* has all along kept close to the beautiful Gradation of the Original. He does not say, as you would have him, That this happy or blessed Man is no vile Wretch, is not polluted with Impiety, and even Sacrilege: But that, "though he is obliged to live among *impious*, and, if you will, *sacrilegious* Men (*tho' that Word with the Poets is seldom used in that high Sense*) yet he did not suffer himself to be corrupted or infected by them; but on the contrary, and notwithstanding their pernicious Example and Counsel, he persisted in a steady Course of Virtue; *eorum contagio eum non flexit de recto tramite*." And what is this but a strict and close Paraphrase of the Original. Blessed is the Man that walketh not in the Counsel of the Ungodly? which is not, as neither is *Buchanan's* Version of it, Blessed is the Man that is not ungodly: But Blessed is he, who is not seduced by their wicked Advice from the

right



*right Path.* To put this Matter, if possible, in a yet clearer light; I ask in the 1<sup>st</sup> Place, where lies the Difference between the *Ungodly* or *Impious* of the *Orig.* Johnston's *impurus grex*, and Buchanan's *Impia contagio sacrilegæ turbæ*. For, I take it, the Word *Rishgnim*, *Ungodly* or *Impious*, signifies such as have cast off all Religion, that regard not God, nor any Thing commanded by, or dedicated to him, which last will also comprehend *Sacrilege*, in the worst Sense of the Word: And is much the same with *Vatablus*'s Explication of it, *IMPIORUM, Rishgnim, improborum, significat eos qui indefinenter & sine ulla quiete impiè agunt*. Again, What Difference is there between *walketh not* in the *Orig.* and Johnston's *Carpit iter*, and Buchanan's *non flexit de recto tramite*. If there is any, Buchanan's seems most expressive, as importing that this *Happy* or *Blessed* Person, is one that is so far from walking or joining with ungodly Men in their abominable Practices, that he cannot be moved by their Example or Inticement, to deviate so much as one Step out of the Path of Virtue. If this is not setting him at the greatest Distance imaginable from the *second* and *third Degrees of Offence described in this Place*, I know not what is. I must observe further, that there is something very emphatical in the Words *contagio* and *turbæ*; the latter signifying that the Number of such wicked Men was very great, and the former that their Example was very infectious. Besides the Word *turbæ* is better chosen than Johnston's *grege*, the one being almost always used in a bad, and the other generally in a good Sense.

You find no Fault directly in the other two Steps of the Gradation. Only you tell us bluntly that he *speaks of an erroneous Way*: But he not only speaks of *iter erroris*, or an *erroneous Way*, which is the same thing with the *Way of Sinners*: For what is *Sin* but a straying from the Commandments of God, (the *trames rectus* mentioned in the first Line?) but he says that *non tenuit. i. e.* though he may sometimes have been *flexus de tramite recto*, yet he did not persist in that his Error, but speedily return'd to the Road of his Duty. The *facilem dedit*

*irrisoribus aurem* I hope you will not deny to signify the same with *Sitting in the Seat of the Scorners*; which is the highest Degree of Impiety. For tho' neither of the Phrases say directly, that this good Man was *no Scorners* or Derider of Religion as these Wretches were, yet if he should give an easy Ear to them, or sit in their Chair, he was upon the very next Point of becoming one himself.\* You see then what you have gain'd by this your ill-grounded Criticism; and that, had you not (whether wilfully or otherwise, you best know) dropt the Consideration of *non flexit*, in the first Line, and the *non tenuit* in the third Line of *Buchanan*, you would not have had any Handle for it at all. To convince you yet farther that he has observed, and that as accurately as *Johnston*, or any other, the gradual Progress of Wickedness described here by the *Psalmist*, I thought it would not be amiss to subjoin the best Paraphrase of the Words that I know of, and which exactly corresponds with that of *Buchanan*, I mean that of the eminently pious and learned Dr. *Patrick*, which is this, "Great is the Happiness of that Man [*Felix ille animi*,] who hath not trod in the Steps of the Ungodly; (who have no other Rule of their Actions but their own Lusts and Passions: [*quem non de tramite recto Impia sacrilega flexit contagio turba*:] or if at any Time he hath been seduced by them, timely retracted his Folly, and did not persist, like those obdurate Wretches, in evil Courses; [*Non iter erroris tenuit*:] much less persever'd so long, or proceeded so far in his Impiety, as to resolve to be one of that pestilent Company, who deride and scoff at all Religion:" [*seessoræ cathedræ Pestiferæ facilem dedit irrisoribus aurem*.] Where you moreover see, that the Ungodly are call'd by Dr. *Patrick* *obdurate Wretches*, which is no better Name than *Buchanan's sacrilega turba*, or *Johnston's grex impurus*; and that what the former calls a pestilent Company, the latter calls the Chair they sit in, *cathedra pestifera*, as in the Vulgate it is named *cathedra pestilentia*. When

\* The same Way as *Affidet insano* in *Horace*, signifies one, that, if he is not really mad, is but one Remove from being so.

When you come to *Johnston* with your Comparison, you tell us. " We have in him no trifling Epithets, no ambiguous Expressions ; but instead of these, all the Ornaments of Oratory (*I suppose you meant Poetry:*) Impiety is represented as a Person, and so is Slander. — But the greatest Perfection of the whole lies in the *Apostrophe* at the Conclusion of the Verse. Here the *Climax* ends, and for this Place this Figure was properly reserved. This Art he learnt from his great Master, who ever employs it on such Occasions." And then you give us three Examples of it in *Virgil*. But these Things must be considered separately.

And first, where, pray, do you find those trifling Epithets you speak of in *Buchanan*? Do *tramite recto*, *sacrilegæ turbæ*, *pestiferæ cathedræ* and *facilem aurem* deserve that Name? If so, all Epithets (which make one of the greatest and most distinguishing Beauties of Poetry) must be laid aside: For I know none more apposite than these. You should at least have here remembered that your Friend the Doctor has the first of these *tramite recto*, (and more frequently I believe, than *Buchanan*), viz. Pf. xxvi. 11. liii. 1. ci. 2. cxvi. 9. cxix. 12. cxxv. 5. not to mention *levo tramite*, Pf. xxxvi. 4. and *obliquo tramite*, Pf. xxxix. 1. which are opposite to it. Has he not Pf. xxxiii. 10. also *sacrilegæ turbæ molimina*, where the Orig. has only *the Counsel of the Heathen*; which shews, as I said above, that that Word with Poets is seldom taken in the worst Sense. And finally, has he not *facilem aurem* Pf. xiii. 3. lxxxviii. 2. cxviii. 21. There remain only *pestiferæ cathedræ*, and *impia contagio*. The former I have shew'd to agree with the *vulgate* or St. *Jerome's* Version, *cathedra pestilentia*, and how can that be better express'd than by *cathedra pestifera*? As to *impia contagio*, does not *Virgil* use *mala contagia*, and *dira contagia*, and tho' perhaps we cannot say *bona*, *utilis*, or *salubris contagio* (tho' I remember that Dr. *Glanvil* speaking of the famous *Greatrix*, who is reported to have cured several Diseases by a Touch or Stroak, says, that he did it by a *sanative Contagion*; and *A. Gellius* xii. 9. reckons it among the *vocabula media* or *communia*, as *facinus*, *valetudo*, *dolus*,



lus, &c.) yet this is certain, that *Contagions* are of divers Kinds as well as Degrees, and *impious* is one of the worst of them.\*

2. As to the Ambiguity in *Felix animi* (for that I suppose you refer to) I have spoke already.

3. As to *Impiety's* being represented as a Person, tho' *Buchanan* does not so represent it in this Verse, yet he does it twice afterwards, viz. in the 5th and 6th Verses,

*Nec coram Impietas mæstos attollere vultus  
—audebit— And Impietas—peribit.*

And was not that sufficient in one Psalm of six Verses, where Dr. *Johnston* has it but once.

4. As to the Apostrophe of *postica sanno*, to which here, and elsewhere, you give such superlative Commendations, I differ as far from you, as the Poles from one another. For you'll excuse me to tell you, that I think it the worst chosen, and the most injudicious Thing in all the Doctor's Performance. *Apostrophe's* indeed, when properly and pertinently brought in, do not want their own Beauty (and some of them are to be found in *Buchanan*, as Ps xviii. 31. xxiii. 1. xxxvi. 1, 2, 3, 4. that noted above li. 17. and lxxxiv. 3. where there are none either in the *Orig.* or in *Johnston*.) But in so grave and solemn a Psalm as this (which is reckoned a Kind of Preface to all the rest) to bring in such an *Apostrophe* as this, *O thou Mistress or Dame Scorn, who flouts or scoffs People behind their back, this happy Man does not sit in thy Chair*, appears to me the most awkward, not to say the most puerile Thing in the World. Besides there is here an Impropriety in the Epithet *postica*, for in *Persius*, whence the

\* Mr. *Lauder* in his *Calumny display'd*, Part iii. p. 55. also finds Fault with *impia contagio*, ist by telling us that *contagio* is almost only used in Prose, and *contagium* or *contagia* by Poets. But there is nothing in that, for *Juvenal* has ii. 78. *Dedit hanc contagio labem*. And what, pray, hinders *Buchanan* from imitating him? 2dly, He does not like *impia contagio*. *Impia contagio*, says he, for *contagio impii hominis*, might perhaps pass: But as it stands here joined with *sacrilega turba* he does not like it so well. But *impia contagio* is not so properly *contagio impii hominis* as *contagio impietatis*. For the Sense is, *Contagio impietatis, quâ, tanquam morbo, sacrilega turba—sive improbi homines contaminati alios inficiunt seu corrumpunt*. In the same Sense as *Claudian*, xviii. 489. has *ignava contagia*, for *contagia ignavia*.

the Phrase is taken, by *postica fanna* is meant these apish Gestures and Grimaces, which light and ill-disposed People use to others behind their Backs.\* Whereas by *Scorners* in the *Orig.* is signified such as openly, and in the Face of good Men, make a Mock of all Religion. I cannot therefore help wishing that so excellent a Poet, as *Johnston* was, had translated that Part of the Psalm otherwise.

You add, as an Enhancement of the Beauty of this *Apostrophe*, that it is at the Conclusion of the Verse: And that *Johnston* learnt this Art from his great Master *Virgil*, who ever employs it on such Occasions. I know no Reason why you should say that *Johnston* learnt the Use of that Figure from *Virgil*, more than any other Poet, for they all abound with it. Nay, there are not a few Instances of it in *Cicero* and other Prose Writers, and a good many in the poetical and prophetic Books of the Old Testament. But why it should shine more brightly at the Conclusion of a Verse or Period, than at the Beginning or Middle of it, I am yet to learn. I am sure it is so far from being true, that *Virgil* employs it always on such Occasions, i. e. at the End of a Period, that in the three Places, where you bring Examples of it from that Author, it is otherwise. They are *Geo.* ii. 96. *Geo.* i. 215. and *Æn.* vi. 841. But what need we speak of the Place of the *Apostrophe*, when *Hermogenes*, whom the above named *Bergerus* commends as one of the best Writers on Composition, excludes it from grave and very serious Subjects; and there are some that think it improper in *Elegiacs*.

But there is one Thing more in *Johnston*, which you have thought prudent to pass over, but to me looks something like a Redundancy in this Verse, or, as you would call it in *Buchanan*, an idle *Expletive*, viz. *per scelus*, for without that the *consilio iniquo*, and the *impuro grege* were

\* This is what the same *Persius* Sat. i. 58 calls *Ciconia*: *O Janes ætergo quem nulla ciconia pinxit.* i. e. "Who by your having two Faces, cannot be derided (as others) behind your Back, by that Kind of Mockery, call'd *Ciconia*, which was by Pointing at one's Back with the Fingers formed into the Resemblance of the Bill of a Stork."

were enough for *the Ungodly*. What makes me take the more Notice of this is, that he uses this *per scelus* very frequently in other Places, where there was little or no Occasion for it; as in *Pf. xi. 2. xvii. 9. xxvi. 10. lix. 5. lxxiii. 12. xcvi. 6. and cxli. 7.* Besides, the Words *per scelus* and *impurus* are of as bad Signification as *impius* and *sacrilegus* with the best *Latin Writers*: And if so, *Johnston* has fallen into the same *Anticlimax* you blame in *Buchanan*; tho' there is no Ground for it in either.

I pass over what you say here of the Versification, for the Reason assign'd above, and go on to (2.) The second Verse, *Sed vitæ rimatur iter melioris*, &c. where you approve *Buchanan's* Translation, but condemn his Language. For, say you, "We had in the preceeding Line but one, *erroris iter*, we have now *Vitæ melioris iter*." This shews a great Poverty of Expression, especially in the five first Lines of this Work. As to *altâ*, it is in this Place but a mere Expletive, brought in on purpose to make out the Line." These are hard Sayings, but let us examine the Truth and Justice of them.

And First, as to *Poverty of Expression* in *Buchanan*, you are infinitely in the wrong to him. For there is none that have read his Works, either in Verse or Prose, who cannot but perceive in him such a Flow of Words, such a Command of the *Latin Tongue*, such an Exuberance, I had almost said Luxuriancy of Diction or Expression, that since the Restoration of Learning, few, very few, have equall'd him, and none at all have excell'd him.

Ay, but he has *iter* twice, within the Compass of three Lines. Because you insist much on this, not only here, but elsewhere, I shall once for all shew that it is nothing but an idle Cavil. 1<sup>st</sup>, By making it appear, that generally speaking there is no Fault in it. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That the greatest Poets and others have not scrupled it. And 3<sup>dly</sup>, That, if it is a Fault, *Johnston* is as much guilty of it as *Buchanan*.

1. That there is generally speaking no Fault in it, appears from this, that in all Speech, whether in Prose or Verse, there are two Things essentially necessary to render it such as it ought to be, that is, both *useful* and agreeable.



able. The one relates to the *Thoughts* or *Sentiments*; the other to the *Words* or *Expressions*. Of the former it is required, that they be just and pertinent to the Subject or Matter we speak of; and of the latter, that they be rightly chosen, that is, that they be the fittest we can think of for conveying these our Sentiments to those we speak to. That the first and chief Place is due to the former of these, no one can doubt. For if there is any Defect in them, no Elegancy or Ornament of Language can compensate it: They will, by their being *inopes rerum*, be nothing else but *canoræ nugæ*, as *Horace* speaks, *Art. poet. v. 322*. But then it is as true, that the Choice of apt and proper Words to express them in, is by no means to be neglected. Both ought to go together, and tho' the one challenges our chief Attention, yet the other is also of considerable Importance, as being a Thing without which our Sentiments will sometimes become obscure or unintelligible, and our Words always to polite Ears harsh and disagreeable. It is therefore justly said by that great Master of Speaking, *Quintilian, Inst. orat. lib. viii. proœm. Verborum curam, rerum volo esse sollicitudinem*. Now, as this *cura* or *delectus verborum* naturally supposes that some Words are in some particular Places more fit than others, nay, that among several Words that come near to one another in their Signification, there may be oftentimes one that is more apt or convenient than any of the rest: Shall we, for the sake of an affected Variety, shun to repeat a Word in a following Sentence or Period, because we had used it a little before, when it is equally fit in both Places, and no other would have been so proper in either Place as that we have made Choice of? That this is often the Case, not only in Writing, but in ordinary Conversation, every body is sensible. And why, pray, should we for no other Reason, but the diversifying of our Language, choose a Word or Phrase less proper to express our Meaning, when another, tho' used before at some little Distance, would much better answer our Purpose? Variety, I own, is a thing very agreeable, but still it ought to give place to good Sense, and that comparatively is always the best Sense that is express'd in the most

most proper Words, whether they occur'd before or not. I know it is a thing very common to furnish young Learners with a large *Copia verborum*, that is, with a Variety of Words and Phrases for expressing the same Things: And we have a great many Books, not to mention Dictionaries, calculated for that Purpose; all which, I confess, are far from being unprofitable, when us'd with due Care and Discernment. But what blundering Work do we oftentimes see these Learners make with them, when for the sake of varying of the Expression, they frequently pitch upon such Words and Phrases as are altogether inept, or much foreign to what was intended. This is what the above-named *Quintilian* complains of having been the Practice of some in his Time in these Words, *Inst. x. 1. Equidem scio quosdam collecta quæ idem significarent vocabula solitos ediscere, quo facilius occurreret unum ex pluribus; & cum usi essent aliquo, si breve intra spatium rursus desideraretur, effugiendæ repetitionis gratiâ sumerent aliud quo idem intelligi posset. Quod cum est puerile & cujusdam infelicis operæ, tum etiam utile parum: turbam enim modò congregat, ex qua sine discrimine occupet proximum quodque* \*. He owns indeed a little below, that there are *alia verba ejus naturæ, ut idem pluribus vocibus declarent, ita ut nihil significationis, quo potius utaris, intersit, ut ensis & gladius: alia quæ etiam propria rerum aliquarum sint nomina, τερατικῶς tamen ad eundem rerum intellectum feruntur, ut ferrum & mucro*. But this notwithstanding, he lays it down for a Rule, as we see before, that a great deal of Judgment is to be used in the Choice of Words. To carry the Thing yet further

\* Much to the same Purpose speaks *F. Lamy* in his most ingenious Treatise de l'Art de parler, liv. i. chap. 18. On s'imagine, dit il, devenir eloquent, pourveu qu'on charge sa memoire de Phrases ramassées dans les Livres de ceux dont l'éloquence est estimée: on se trompe fort, & ceux qui suivent cette Methode, ne parlent jamais juste. Car ils accommodent les choses qu'ils traittent à ces Phrases, sans se souvenir du lieu où les Auteurs de qui ils les ont prises, les avoient appliquées: ainsi leur Discours est semblable à ces habits qu'on achete chez les Frippiers, qui ne sont jamais si justes que ceux que l'on fait faire pour soi. And I remember that *Dr. Trapp*, tho' no Friend to Repetitions of the same Words, yet is much against the Use of *Theatrum Poeticum*, and such like common-place Books, on the above Account,

ther  
wh  
alia  
plus  
acco  
mor  
grea  
the  
ing  
wou  
that  
form  
at th  
tors,  
with  
with  
they  
so far  
the P  
they v  
nefs,  
Benit  
famou  
take th  
had ta  
far's V  
have r  
to be a  
that in  
were  
self + f  
fice th  
and the  
res, as  
(speaki

His  
fortunam  
num sequi  
\* Mr.  
the P

ther home, he adds, that tho' there may be many Words, whose Signification is almost or altogether the same, yet *alia sunt aliis aut magis propria, aut magis ornata, aut plus efficientia, aut melius sonantia*; and concludes, that according as these Qualities of Words take place, *optimorum semper fiat electio*. From this Direction of that great Author, we may draw this obvious *Corollary*, that the Repetition of the same Word is often so far from being blame-worthy, that the changing of it for another would be a Fault; which it would certainly be, when that other wanted any of the Properties of that we had formerly used. For my own Part I have often wondred at the *fastidiosa aures* of some of our modern Commentators, who are so fantastically nice, and so much taken up with that affected Variety, that they cannot forsooth away with a great many Passages in the best Authors, in which they meet with such Repetitions. And some have gone so far as of their own Head to substitute other Words in the Place of those, which (for no other Reason but that they were said before) offended their delicate Ears. Witness, among many others, the otherwise learned *Thomas Bentley*, who treading in the Footsteps of his Uncle the famous *Dr. Richard Bentley*, and thinking that he might take the same Freedom with the Classics that his Friend had taken before, has lately given us an Edition of *Cæsar's Works*, wherein he, but especially *Dr. Jurin*, would have many Places in which they found such Repetitions to be altered. Nay, he is so fond of this his Performance, that in his Preface he has the Vanity to assert, that *Cæsar*, were he alive, could not but highly congratulate himself † for this (for ought I can see) the principal good Office they have done him. But if we shall go on in this and the like licentious Manner, *grassandi in bonos Auctores*, as *Burman* expresses it, or as another very elegantly \* (speaking of *Dr. Bentley* and *Mr. Davis's* Emendations

on

† His remarkable Words are, *Fastavi presertim sæpe inter sodales meos, fortunam illam perpetuò bonam, quæ Cæsarem vivum comitata est, nunc morum sequi, quippe qui Jurinum Emendatorem, me verò Editorem nactus sit.*

\* *Mr. Olivet*, Fellow of the Royal Academy of Eloquence at *Paris*, in the Preface to his late noble Edition of *Cicero's Works*.



on some of *Cicero's* Works) *novos, loco veterum, Cicerones, Caesares, Virgilios, &c. architectandi*, I know not where we shall at last stop; and that perhaps we should do as well to keep these Authors, as they were convey'd to us through the Hands of ignorant Monks, as to have them thus metamorphos'd and disguis'd, or in *Terence's* Words, *ita immutarier, ut non cognoscas eosdem esse*. This I am sure of, that the incomparably learned, as well as elegant *Jo. Gul. Bergerus*, who seems to have understood both the Sense and the Beauties of *Caesar*, as well, if not better, than *Davis*, *Dr. Furin*, or either of the *Bentleys*, is of a contrary Mind, and is so far from condemning these Repetitions, that he reckons it among *Caesar's* peculiar Excellencies. See him to that Purpose in his admirable Treatise, *de naturali orationis pulchritudine*, &c. from p. 235 to p. 242. But enough for the Reasonableness of the Thing. I come next,

2. To justify *Buchanan's* Practice by the Examples of the best Authors. But because it would be an endless Task, to produce the vast Numbers of them that occur in other Poets, I shall confine myself to him, whom you eminently single out as *Johnston's* great Master, the immortal *Virgil*, and bring some few of many of those Repetitions that are to be found in him.

*Ecl. i. v. 3. patriæ*, and Line following *patriam*.

*v. 28. respexit*, and repeated two Lines after.

*v. 76. viridi*, and *v. 81. viridi*.

*Ecl. iv. v. 16. Permixtos heroas. 26. heroum laudes*, and 35. *delectos heroas*.

*Ecl. vi. 54. ruminat herbas*, and 59. *herbâ captum*.

*Geo. i. 359. littora misceri*, and three Lines after, *ad littora*.

*Geo. ii. 433. curam*, and 439. *curæ*.

*Geo. iii. 494. herbis*, 498. *herbæ*, and 528. *herbæ*.

*Geo. iv. 387. gurgite*, and four Lines after, *gurgite*.

*v. 396. vinclis*, and three Lines after, *vincula*, and six Lines after, *vinclis*, and again four Lines after, *vinclis*, and three Lines after that, *vincla*.

*Æn. i. 557. Italiam*, and Line following, *Italiam*.

*Æn. ii. 234. Muros*, and three Lines after, *muros*.

ſ. 443. *tela*, and five Lines after, *telis*, and twelve Lines after, *tela*, and nine Lines after, *telorum*, and two Lines after, *telis*: And then 520. *telis*, 527. *tela*, and 544. *telum*.

*Æn.* v. 252. *Ida*, and two Lines after, *Ida*.

ſ. 489. *malo ſuſpēdit ab alto*, and 511. *malo pēdebat ab alto*.

ſ. 493. *ludo*, 596. *ludunt*, and 605. *ludis*.

ſ. 598. *celebrare*, and 603. *celebrata*.

*Æn.* vi. 257. *umbram*, 264. *umbræ*, 268. *umbram*, 271. *umbra*, 289. *umbræ*, 294. *umbras*, 340. *umbra*, 390. *umbrarum*, and 401 and 404. *umbras*.

*Æn.* vii. 87. *ſub nocte ſilenti*, and 102. *monitusque ſilenti Noctē datos*.

*Æn.* ix. 409. *tela*, 417. *telum*, 420. *teli*. And 480. *telorum*, and 493. 496. 509. *tela*, *telo*, *telorum*. And again, 534. 543. 552. 555. 559. *tela*, *telis*, *tela*, *tela*, *telo*.

Theſe few Inſtances I have pick'd up from *Virgil*, not doubting that there are many more ſuch to be had in him. I forbear to bring any (as I ſaid) from other Authors: Only I cannot omit here to give you the Opinion in this Matter of *Janus Broukhuſius*, whom you call, and moſt juſtly, *Suppl.* p. 45. an admirable Scholar, a very acute Critick, and no mean Poet, and who, you ſay, principally contributed towards raiſing *Johnſton's Reputation* to ſo great an Height in foreign Parts. This great Man, on theſe Words of *Propertius*, *Eleg.* i. 10. 20. — *Quæcunque petenda, Quæque cavenda forent*, which *Scaliger* read and publiſhed, *Quæque verenda forent*, has this Note, *Meliùs meo palato vulgata cavenda, quod & in ſeptem libris MSS. liquidò exſtat: nec movere quenquam debet tã cave in verſu proximo, quum ejusmodi repetitionum ſexcenta exempla vel unus facile ſuppeditaverit Papinius; nec valde deſugiant poëtæ eo etiam meliores*. Where probably he had *Virgil* himſelf in his Eye. But if neither the Reason of the Thing, nor the Examples and Authority of the beſt Writers and Criticks will move you, there remains what in a particular manner will oblige you to drop this frivolous Pretence, viz.

3. That, if it is a Fault in *Buchanan* (as I have ſhew'd

It is not) to repeat the same Word at a small Distance then it is no less a Fault in *Johnston*, who has practised it, for ought I know, as oft as the other. Of the Examples I have transiently observ'd of that kind in him, take these following:

In this very 1st *Psalms* we have, *ψ*. 3. *auris*, and three Lines after, *aura*.

*Pf*. ii. 4. *ira*, and in the next Line, *iræ*, and *ψ*. 12. *iram*.

vi. 7. *hostiles*, and *ψ*. 10. *hostica*.

vii. 5. *premat*, and 13. *premet*. So *dolo*, *ψ*. 8. and *dolum*, *ψ*. 15.

x. 2. 6. 14. *canam*, *canat*, *canam*.

xvii. 1. 4. *doli*, *dolo*.

xviii. 14. 16. 20. 24. *manu*, *mann*, *manus*, *manus*, and so *Pf*. xx. 6. 8. *manus*, *manus*.

xxv. 4. 8. 10. *iter*, *iter*, *iter*, the very Word *Buchanan* is blamed for. Add *ψ*. 4 and 14. *pande* and *pandet*.

xxvii. 4. 8. 12. *ore*, *ore*, *ore*.

xxxiv. 17 and 18. *malis*, *malis*.

xxxvii. 9. 12. *gens impia*, *gens impia*. And 14. 21. 39. *impius*, *impius*, *impia*. And 16. 18. *opes*, *opes*. And 8. 28. 38. *ruas*, *ruet*, *ruet*. And 6. 13. 37. *diem*, *diem*, *dies*. And 15. 21. 24. *manu*, *manus*, *manum*. And 13. 16. *aula*, *aulæ*.

xxxviii. 1. 3. *iram*, *iræ*. And 9. 15. *vota*, *vota*.

xliv. 1. 3. *dextra*, *dextram*.

xlvi. 1. 3. 5. *triumphatis*, *triumphatos*, *triumphali*.

li. 17. 19. *placat*, *placato*.

lv. 4. 10. *micat*, *micat*.

lxvi. 6. 7. 8. *pede*, *pede*, *pedes*.

lxxvi. 9. 10. *premeretur*, *premes*.

lxxxv. 7. 8. 10. 13. *pace*, *pacis*, *pax*, *pax*.

lxxxix. 3. *fœdus* and *fœderis*, 5. 8. *fœdera*, *fœdera*, 24. 26. *fœderis*, *fœderis*, 28. *fœdus*, 31. 35. 39. *fœdera*, *fœdera*. The Word used in this *Psalms* ten times, whereas *Buchanan* has it but seven times, viz. 3. 28. 30. 34. 39. 49. *fœdera*, and 35. *fœdere*.

cv. 3. and next Line, *pius*, *pius*, and four Lines after, *pin*.

*piis*,  
has it

*Ibid*

four

cxx

If it

*Virgil*

carry

may i

good

And to

gainst,

iter to

Phrase

ting *H*

what I

with a

Poet,

—

Then

this 2d

“ that i

“ make

with ali

*Manet*

cix. 14.

mente le

alta men

I hope,

and con

conceiv

outer an

sentation

deepest

and Com

Such a th

way as v

fore, im

Now as

ver, an



piis, and seven Lines after, *pio*; four times. *Buchanan* has it not so much as once.

*Ibid.* 18. *vincla*, and three Lines after, *vincula*, and four Lines after, *vinclis*.

cxxxvi. 11. *ab undis*, and 14. *ab undis*.

If it be said, that in some of these Instances, either of *Virgil* or *Johnston*, the Repetition of the same Word may carry a particular *Emphasis* along with it, as perhaps it may in some few of them; the same will equally hold good in some of these which you blame *Buchanan* for: And to go no farther, in that which you here cry out against, we have a beautiful *Antithesis* of the *vita melioris* iter to *iter erroris*: Not to mention the Elegancy of the Phrase *vita melioris*, for *vita optima*, something imitating *Horace's Doctus iter melius*. May I not now, after what I have said upon these Repetitions, apply to you, with a little Alteration, the Words of *Ascanius* in the Poet,

—— *I verbis Buchananum illude superbis?*

There remains yet one Thing to be taken Notice of in this 2d Verse, *viz.* what you say of the Word *altâ*, "that it is a mere Expletive; brought in on purpose to make out the Line." It seems you are not offended with *altâ mente* in general, as knowing that *Virgil* has *Manet altâ mente repositum*; and your own *Johnston*, *Pf.* cix. 14. *Altâ mente reconde*, and *Pf.* cxix. 153. *altâ Qui mente legem condidi*: But the Fault, as I take you, lies in *altâ mente's* being join'd with *revolvit*. As to which, Sir, I hope, I need not tell you, that *mens*, tho' of a spiritual, and consequently of an indivisible Nature, is figuratively conceiv'd as a material thing, that hath higher and lower, outer and inner Parts in it. According to which Representation of it, it is also supposed that that which lies deepest or most inward in it, is of the greatest Moment and Concern to the Person. Thus we say, that such and such a thing lies deep in one's Mind or Heart, the same way as we say in *Latin*, *imo corde*, *imis sensibus*, *imo pectore*, *imis medullis* *barere*, *premere*, *reponere*, *infigere*, &c. Now as *revolvere* signifies to roll or turn a thing over and over, and metaphorically with *mente* join'd with it, to

*think again and again, i. e. frequently of, it :* What hinders but that *that* Thinking may be more or less serious, with more or less Intenfeness or Application of the Mind; and if so, that greater or extraordinary Intenfeness of Thought may very well admit to be said to be exercised *in alta mente*, in the very Bottom, if I may so speak, of the *Mind* or *Soul*. It is in this very Sense that *Virgil* says oftner than once, — *astuat ingens Imo in corde pudor*, *Æn.* x. 860. and *Æn.* xii. 666. where, if *alta* is an idle Epithet to *mente* after *revolvit*, so is *imo* to *corde* after *astuat*. And if the same Author could say of the *Titans* that rebell'd against Heaven, that *fundo volvuntur in imo*, they were tofs'd, or tofs'd themselves, in the lowest or deepest Place of *Tartarus* or *Hell*, might he not have said, *se perpetuo volvunt revolvuntque in imo Tartari fundo*? And may it not be said with the same Propriety, that the good or happy Man, *revolvit Dei leges alta mente*, i. e. *meditates* upon or *studies* them with the closest and deepest Application of his Mind. *Yule* (to whom you own yourself obliged on another Occasion, see above, p. 195.) will also help you here to understand *Buchanan*, whose Words he thus and very justly paraphrases, *Magna animi contentione doctrinam sacra Scripturae assidue legens ac re-legens meditatur* \*.

(3.) I go on to Verse 3d, *Ille velut rigue*, &c. where you own the Versification to be very good; but otherwise you have many Faults to it.

1st, "*Buchanan*, you say, has entirely omitted, *Whatsoever he doth shall prosper*." I answer, He has not indeed any thing answering precisely to these very Words; but then he has upon the Matter all that is contain'd in or signified by them. For in comparing him to a Tree that never fails to bring forth a plentiful Increase, it is plainly intimated that all his Actions shall be attended

\* And much to the same Purpose are the Words of *Gutherlath* cited above, p. 228.

*Paginatam viam salutis qui sacratum Codicem  
Volvit ardens & revolvit sedulo conamine:*

Which are a kind of Paraphrase of this Passage; and the *ardens* and *sedulo conamine* are stronger than *Buchanan's* *alta mente*.

tended with good Success; otherwise the Comparison would not be just. For thus *Vatablus* paraphrases or explains the Words, *Et quicquid facit prosperos habet successus*, i. e. *fructus edit qui non pereunt*; which probably made *Buchanan* omit them, as being upon the Matter signified by what he had said before. But be that as it will, you ought to excuse it in *Buchanan* for *Johnston's* sake, who is guilty of many more Omissions of that kind than he. See above p. 20.

2dly, You say, "He has added out of his own Invention the *violento Sirius aestu*, and the *non torret hyems*." No more out of his own Invention than *Johnston's* *Nul-laue vernantes decutit aura comas*. Only in *Buchanan* we have a truly poetical and beautiful Paraphrase of the Words, *His Leaf also shall not wither*. For what is it that makes the Leaves of Trees to wither, but the two very different Dispositions of the Air or Weather, the *Heat of Summer*, and the *Cold of Winter*? And is there any thing more usual with Poets than to describe the extreme Heat of Summer, by the *Sirius* or *Dog-star's* then appearing in the Heavens? whence *Virgil* calls it *Sirius ardor*, and says of it, that *Sirius Indos ardebat*, and — *tum steriles exurere Sirius agros*. And again, are not *uro*, *ad-uro* and *torreo* applied to excessive Cold as well as Heat; as, *Boreæ penetrabile frigus adurit* in the same *Virgil*, and *Frigore torrere* in *Varro*, and *Pecora frigore torrida* in *Cicero*? This therefore that you blame in *Buchanan*, is one of his finest Strokes, it being one of the chief Excellencies of Poetry to particularize what is told more generally in *Proté*. Thus, whereas *Johnston* has simply *nulla aura*, no Air or Disposition of the Weather did make the Leaves of that Tree wither: *Buchanan*, in a truly poetical Manner, particularly mentions the two Kinds of Weather or Causes that usually produce that Effect.

3dly, You say "there is an Impropriety in saying first, *that a Tree brings forth abundantly*, and then, *that it does not flatter its Owner with perishing Blossoms*." This you had told us above, *Suppl. p. 9.* and I have shew'd the Emptiness of it above, p. 142.

4thly, You tell us, "that you observed in the foregoing  
S. 3 "ing



ing Verse how idly an Adjective was clapt at the End of the Line for the sake of the Metre; here we have very unhappily two, *prodiga* and *lato*, neither of which Words signify any thing to the Sense, but are mere Expletives. Neither is the *inanem* less trifling at the Conclusion of the whole Verse." Would any Man that knows what Poetry is, talk at this Rate? For if such Adjectives or Epithets are to be laid aside, and lookt upon as mere Expletives, then farewell to all Poetry, and I may say to all Language whatsoever. But what is there in these that renders them idle, superfluous and trifling? Is every *arbor prodiga*, or abounding with Fruit; and every *proventus latus*, or such as gives great Joy to the Owner; and no *dominus inanis*, or empty and disappointed of his Hope? How comes *Horace* then to say, *Epist. i. 7. 41. locus — multæ prodigus herba*, and *Ovid. Met. xv. 81. Prodiga tellus*? Is there any thing more common with Poets than *Latus ager*, *lætæ fruges*, *lætæ segetes*, *lætæ herba*, *lætâ pascua*, *lætâ sata*, &c. And is it not an elegant and poetical way of speaking to say, *blandâ dominum spe lactat inanem*, for *lactat dominum blandâ sed inani spe*? Is it not thus that *Virgil* says, *Geo. ii. 285. Non animum modò uti pascat prospectus inanem*, for *uti animus pascatur inani prospectu*?

(4.) Proceed we to the 4th Verse, *Non ita divini gens nescia fœderis*, &c. To this, after your laudable Custom, you have also many Objections. As,

1. "That *Buchanan* is too tedious in his Interpretation of the Word *Ungodly*. He employs a Line and an half on it alone." And is not that the Nature of all true Poetry to amplify and enlarge upon the Subject. If Poetry was confined to express things in as few Words as possible, it would no longer be Poetry; for that would be to devest it of these Ornaments in which its chief Beauty does consist. And are not periphrastical Descriptions of Persons and Things among the most considerable of them? This is so well known, that it would be a doubting of my Readers — Judgment to produce Examples of it.

2. Your second Objection is, "That he in the same manner

"manner represents *Chaff* (which he for the Verse sake calls *Dust*) first toss'd about with a Whirlwind, and "then driven about, either by a Wheel, or in a Circle, "in the empty Sky." And, pray, where lies the Difference between *Chaff* and *Dust* in this Comparifon? Are they not equally driven about, and blown away by the Wind? It was not for the fake of the Verse, as you alledge, that he chose *pulveris*: For had he thought there was any Odds, he could have said, —*raptæ Instar erunt paleæ — quam*. But he knew that *Pulveris instar erunt* was much more harmonious, and would equally answer the Intention of the Original. But why should I mention this, when the *Vulgate* has this very Word, *tanquam pulvis quem projicit ventus à facie terræ*? The Hebrew Word is *cammoz*, or *cammotz*; which *Vatablus* renders *gluma*, *quisquiliæ*, *pulvis*, *minutum palearum* \*. But where do you find a Wheel in the Word *gyrus*? that Word being always us'd, not for a *Wheel*, but for the *circular Figure* in which any thing is moved. *Johnston's* Word *rotat*, from *rota*, the proper Word for a *Wheel*, comes much nearer to that Signification. As to the Insinuation you make, that the Paraphrase is here too tedious, I give the same Answer as above: And tho' I could bring several Examples to justify *Buchanan* in it, I shall only mention these two, where the flying of *Dust*, as here, is described in almost as loose and diffused a Manner. The first from *Virgil*, *Æn. ix. 33*.

*Hic subitam nigro glomerari pulvere nubem  
Prospiciunt Teucris, ac tenebras insurgere campis.*

S 4

The

\* The not more eminent for Dignity, than for his excellent Abilities as a Poet, Cardinal Barberini, afterwards Pope Urban VIII. in his Paraphrase of this very Psalm, uses the Word *pulvis*,

*Non sic iniquus: sed velut impetu  
Abreptus Enri pulvis in aëra  
Vanescat, exturbatus aquo  
Judicio athereis ab oris.*

And before him that noble Italian Poet *Flaminius*,

*—Haud sic improbi, sed pulverem  
Ut turbo late difficit:  
Sic jactat illos impetus libidinum,  
Nulloque consistunt loco,*

The second from *Sil. Italicus*,

*It globus intorquens nigranti turbine nubem  
Pulveris*——

To which I might add that of *Buchanan*, *Pf. xviii. 42.*

*Hos ego, ceu versat Boreæ violentia nubem  
Pulveream impello*——

where in the *Orig.* we have *Dust*, as here *Chaff*, both to the same Purpose.

But I must further observe, that the Diffusedness you and *Mr. Lauder*, *Cal. display'd, Part iii. p. 56.* complain of in this and the preceeding Verse of *Buchanan's* Version, is a noble Imitation of *Virgil*. For as both Verses contain Comparisons, the one of a good Man to a fruitful Tree, the other of a wicked Man to Dust or Chaff toss'd with the Wind; so it is especially remarkable, that that great Author, tho' pretty concise and reserv'd upon other Occasions, yet in such like Comparisons (with which he abounds) usually gives a Loose to his Fancy, and with a more than ordinary Profusion of Words, expatiates and enlarges upon them for many Lines together. Examples of this are innumerable, but I shall only instance one, as having some Resemblance to that you here find Fault with. It is in *Æn. vii. 378.*

*Ceu quondam torto volitans sub verbere turbo,  
Quem pueri magno in gyro vacua atria circum  
Intenti ludo exercent. Ille actus habenâ  
Curvatis fertur spatiis: stupet inscia turba,  
Impubesque manus, mirata volubile buxum:  
Dant animos plage.*——

Where we have *turbo*, *gyro* and *vacua*, the same Words as in *Buchanan*; and the *torto verbere*, *habenâ* and *plage*; as also the *turbo* and *volubile buxum*; the *gyro* and *curvatis spatiis*; the *pueri* and *impubes manus*: all much of the same Signification. After this (which yet is one of the most beautiful Passages in all *Virgil*) let *Mr. Benson* accuse *Buchanan*, of being too diffused or; *Mr. Lauder*, for his using several different Words to express the same thing.

3dly, You have a Cavil at *Ludibria*, saying, "It should have been *ludibrium*, to have agreed with *quem*." But you are out here; for the *quem* is to be refer'd to *pulve-*  
ris,



ris, and not directly to *ludibria*, the full Sentence being *pulveris; quem pulverem*—and it is with this last Word *pulverem* that *ludibria* must agree, and that in Case only, by the Figure called *Appositio*. And I know no Grammarian, not *Lily* himself, that requires that these or such like Substantives, belonging to the same thing, should agree in Number; for we have innumerable Examples to the contrary. Virg. *Corydon ardebat Alexin Delicias Domini*. Ovid. *Quid mernistis oves placidum pecus*. Liv. *Celtiberi novus miles*. And if it should be said, that in the two last Examples, *pecus* and *miles* are taken collectively, so it may be said of *pulvis*; for that being made up of numberless Atoms, or small Particles, may be accounted a Collective, and so may admit of a Plural to be join'd with it. I might also add, that in the Latin Idiom, there are a great many Words which are used, especially with the Poets, either in the Singular or Plural, promiscuously; such as, *collum* and *colla*, *cervix* and *cervi-ces*, *pectus* and *pectora*, *littus* and *littora*, &c. where only one Neck, Breast, Shore, &c. are signified.

(5.) Come we to the 5th Verse, *Ergo ubi veridicus judex*, &c. And to it you make these Exceptions.

1. "That of these four Lines of *Buchanan*, the first is all superfluous and trifling, except the Words *ubi* and *judex*: What does *veridicus* signify in this Place; and what is *nube serenâ* put in for, but purely to make the necessary Number of Feet?" This is truly strange! That *Buchanan* the Prince of modern Poets can hardly give us one right Line! All the Words here superfluous except two short ones, *ubi* and *judex*! and *nube serenâ* is put in to make up the Feet! And why not *Ergo* and *veridicus*, for they being also superfluous, as you say, what else were they good for? But what ails you at the Word *Ergo*, *Therefore*? for that is the precise Word in the Text. Yes, but *Johnston* wants it, and he is to be the Standard. And must *judex* have no Epithet, because his *judicis* has none? I thought till now, and have frequently told it before, that a proper Epithet was a great Beauty in Verse: And what more proper to *Judex*, especially the just and impartial Judge of the World, than *veridicus*?

for

for what is *veridicus*, but *is qui verum dicit*? And is not *verus* in the best Authors oftentimes the same with *justus* and *æquus*?

*Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est,*

i. e. *justum*. Hor.

—*me verius unum pro vobis fœdus luere,*

i. e. *justius*. Virg.

And since it is agreed by all Commentators that in this Verse is signified the great and general Judgment of the *last Day*, what makes it trifling, that one of the most remarkable Circumstances of it, *viz.* the Place where the great Judge's awful Tribunal is to be erected, should be mentioned? I mean in the *Clouds* or *the Air*, as we are frequently told in the New Testament. And who can doubt that these *Clouds* will then be serene, and that *Day* signally bright and *glorious*, when the most solemn Act that ever was, or can be in the World, is to be gone about; and that it is most fit and proper, that as all Mankind are to be concern'd in it, so they should all have a full and perfect View of what is then to pass upon them? But finally, if it be said, that tho' these Things are implied, yet they are not express'd in the *Orig.* I answer that as little are *Johnston's Words*,

*Ultima cum dirimet fasque nefasque dies.*

And if you should say, as you do upon other Occasions, that this Addition of *Johnston's* serves to heighten the Sense of the *Orig.* I can with full as much Justice say the same of *Buchanan's*.

2. You here renew the Fling you had before, *p. 11.* 'at the Word *coarguet*, by telling us, " That it is a rank " Prose Word, and not to be endured in any sort of " Poetry." But see the Return I have made to this above *p. 148.*

(6.) There remains the 6th and last Verse of this Psalm, *Nam pater æthereus*, &c. And that it may not fare better than the fore-going ones, you find several Faults in it. As

1. That the Translation is too much diffus'd in the *novit iter, sensumque tenet*. But I have said enough in answer to this already. Only I must here add, that there

is something more in *sensum tenet*, than in *novit iter*, as express'd in *Latin*, i. e. than simply that God knows the *Way of Righteous Men*, viz. that he also takes particular Notice of and will highly reward their upright Intentions: Both which, as Commentators observe, are comprehended under the *Hebrew Word Jodegn*, to know. This *Yule* was sensible of, and therefore justly paraphrases *Buchanan's Words*, *Deus honorum vitam & mores probat, quidque sentiant cognitum & compertum habens in rationes suas refert.*

2. You quarrel "the Repetition of the Word *Impietas*, which we had in the preceeding Verse, and of *fraude* and *fraudum* both in this very same Verse." But, besides what I said before on the Head of Repetitions, it may be further observ'd, that there seems to be an emphatical Beauty in repeating the Word. In the 5th Verse, it is said of *Impietas*, as of a Person, that she dares not lift up her Head in Judgment. And here it is said of the same accursed Creature *Impietas*, as of a Person, that she shall at last utterly perish. And this will in some Measure account for the Epithet of *scelerata* to *Impietas*, (which here and *Suppl. p. 11.* you so much condemn.) For *Impietas* here is not to be taken directly for *Vice* or *Wickedness* in the Abstract, but by an elegant *Prosopopée* for a very vicious or wicked Creature, q. d. *scelerum mater, scelerum inventrix* or *creatrix*, the same way as *Ovid* says *Heroid. vi. 137. scelerata Medea*, and *Remed. 299. scelerata puella*. But this I submit to the Judgment of the more learned.

As to the *fraude* and then *fraudum* in this Verse, I think the Repetition better, than if it were otherwise. For in it we have (as I apprehend) a beautiful *Opposition* or *Antithesis* between the *fraude carentes* and the *fraudes secuti*: Which I would prefer to *labe carentum*, as *Buchanan* might (had he affected Variety) have rendred it in the former of these two Places.

Buchanan



Buchanan and Johnston's 104th Psalm  
compared.

HAVING gone through this first Psalm, and clear'd it, I hope to the Satisfaction of all impartial Judges, from all the numerous Aspersions, you have unjustly thrown upon it; nay, and generally speaking, have shew'd that what you condemn as Vices in it, are some of its greatest Virtues: I proceed now with you to the 104th Psalm. This you acknowledge in the Beginning of your Conclusion to have been reckoned *an inimitable Performance*: And truly so it was. For Harry Stephen says of it, when he first published it with some others Anno 1556, in his Dedication to their Author; *In transferendis reliquis hujus sacrosancti Poetæ Odis, Buchananus fuisti, id est, inter reliquos omnes Interpretes tantum quantum Luna inter minora sidera enituisi: at, postquam ad Psalmum civ. ventum est, Buchananum vicisti.* And much to the same Purpose Daniel Heinsius (that Heinsius, whom the incomparable Grotius more than once styles *Princeps literarum*) says of it, *Psalmus iste Rex est ceterorum.\** But all this notwithstanding, I will not say simply, *Homo homini quid interest!* but *Homo unus quid ceteris penè omnibus interest!* For you at last appear, and by your superlative Skill in critical or (shall I rather call it) *hypercritical* Learning, will forsooth confound Buchanan and all his Admirers, and (if we will be taught by you) will shew that this so much celebrated Psalm hath not one right Line, and almost not a right Word in it all. One would have thought, that the Fate Dr. Eglesham met with for attacking this very Psalm upwards of a hundred Years ago; might have deterr'd you from so audacious an Attempt. You have, or might have read how much the Folly and Vanity of that fantastical Doctor was exposed and ridicul'd by your own favourite Author, as also by the above named Daniel Heinsius, *loc. cit.* but especially by his own very ingenious and learned Countryman Dr. William Barclay, who has not only re-

futed

\* Burmani Sylloge Epistol. illustr. vol. ii, epist. 227.

futed all the Cavils and Abuses vented against it by that whimsical Doctor, but likewise display'd the hidden Beauties of that Psalm, which few before were capable to discern. But as there is a certain Kind of Courage, which no Danger can intimidate, no Misadventures of others can frighten; so you, not heeding what befell Dr. *Eglestham*, and that nothing may rival, far less eclipse, as you fancy, *Johnston's* Glory, will needs take up that Doctor's Cause again; though I am pretty confident that in the Event your Success will not be a whit better than his. However in the new Attack you make on this Psalm, you do not altogether tread in the Doctor's Footsteps: For tho' in some Things you chime in with him; yet in others you go quite contrary to him, allowing even some Things to pass for Beauties, which he accounted Deformities: But generally you have made it your Business to find out new Blemishes, which neither the Doctor, tho' otherwise sufficiently inclin'd to it, nor any other ever dream'd of. I shall with the same Impartiality I have hitherto observed, consider all of them, and am hopeful to make it appear, that most, if not all, have no other Foundation, but what your extreme Fondness for *Johnston*, and your inveterate Prejudice against *Buchanan* have suggested.

To begin then with the first five Lines of *Buchanan*, which you will have to answer to the 1st Verse of this Ps.

*Te rerum, Deus alme, canam Dominumque patremque:*

*Magne parens, sanctâ quàm majestate verendus,*

*Ætheris æternas rector moliris habenas!*

*Te decor, auratis ambit te gloria pennis,*

*Et circumfufum vestit pro tegmine lumen.*

Your Remarks are, " That the Simplicity and Grandeur  
" of the Beginning of this sublime Psalm is lost by the  
" great Number of additional Ideas, which *Buchanan* has  
" injudiciously introduced in his Translation. How of-  
" ten, you add, has God been stiled before we came to  
" this Place, *rerum Dominumque patremque*, and how  
" insipidly is *patrem* immediately followed by *magne*  
" *parens*? The whole of *Ætheris æternas rector moliris*  
" *habenas* is foreign to the Purpose, and *decor* is brought  
" in

" in between *majestas* and *gloria*, merely for the Sake of  
 " the Metre. In the last Place, it must be observed,  
 " that *Buchanan* has taken a great Part of the next Verse  
 " to make up this, and at the same time has destroy'd half  
 " its Energy. How great a Difference is there between  
 " saying, *Thou cloathest thyself with Light as with a*  
 " *Garment*, and, *Thou art cloathed with Light, &c.* In the  
 " latter Sentiment, the Action ceases, and consequent-  
 " ly the Verse languishes."

What a Deal of Faults here? but we must consider  
 them separately. And

1. You call this Psalm *sublime*, and so it truly is: But  
 you say that *the Simplicity and Grandeur of the Beginning*  
*of it is here lost by additional Ideas.* I am glad that for  
 once you allow that *Grandeur* can consist with *Simplicity*,  
 when yet a great deal of your former Notes upon this  
 Author point at the contrary. Dr. *Eglesham* had con-  
 demn'd this *Simplicity* in *Buchanan*, and said, as you also  
 do, that *some* of his Verses in this Psalm, and you say  
*almost every where, Suppl. p. 10 and 11. solutam potius ora-*  
*tionem quam heroici versûs majestatem redolent.* But Dr.  
*Barclay* has show'd that there are a thousand Verses in  
*Virgil* (of which he gives us some Instances) *quorum ipsa*  
*simplicitas virtus est, non vitium.* And this is confirm'd  
 by that great Master of Eloquence *Quintilian, lib. viii. cap.*

3. *Vim rebus aliquando & ipsa verborum humilitas adfert.*  
 But this *Simplicity is lost by additional Ideas.* If these I-  
 deas are far fetch'd and affected, I grant it: But not, if  
 they are plain and natural, as here. But that *Grandeur*  
 (which you also add) should be *lost by additional Ideas*,  
 is what I cannot be brought to believe. I thought the  
 Matter had been quite otherwise, and that *additional I-*  
*deas*, such as are made up of Epithets, Amplifications,  
 Descriptions, &c. when pertinent and judiciously cho-  
 sen, did constitute a great Part of it. Is the *Grandeur* lost  
 in that of *Virgil* cited above, wherein *Venus*, instead of  
 saying simply, *O Jupiter*, addresses him thus,

*O pater, O hominum Divûmque æterna potestas:*  
 in every Word of which there is an *additional Idea.* Or

In the  
the I  
Ip  
Re  
Fil

Æ  
Or th

In all  
thers,  
which  
here in

Te  
where  
Quoni  
Proph  
ce, sap  
DEUI  
(I add  
additio  
self.\*

\* The  
self from  
ment of  
he ment  
tion to w  
David Pl  
as the S  
atena pot  
himself  
Deus. U  
Justice by  
as a merc



In these Descriptions of that supposed supreme Deity by the same Author;

*Ipsè Deûm*

*Regnator, cœlum & terras qui numine torquet.* And,

*Filius huic contra, torquet qui sidera mundi.* And,

*O qui res hominumque Deûmque*

*Æternis regis imperiis, & fulmine terres?*

Or these in Horace,

*Quid prius dicam solitis parentis*

*Laudibus, qui res hominum ac Deorum,*

*Qui mare & terras variisque mundum*

*Temperat horis?* And

*Qui terram inertem, qui mare temperat*

*Ventosum, & urbes, regnaque tristia,*

*Divosque mortalesque turmas*

*Imperio regit unus æquo?*

In all which Places, and I could bring innumerable others, the *Grandeur* chiefly consists in the *additional Ideas*, which are there represented to the Mind. And so it does here in the Words,

*Te rerum, Deus alme, canam Dominumque patremque :*

where, as is most ingeniously observ'd by Dr. Barclay,

*Quoniam ineffabile nomen quatuor literarum, quo utitur*

*Propheta, exprimi non potest ullâ aut cogitatione aut vo-*

*ce, sapientissimus poeta [Buch.] quatuor ponit epitheta,*

*DEUM, ALMUM, DOMINUM, PATREM.* And

(I add) it is in the three last of these (which you call

*additional Ideas*) that the *Grandeur* of this Line shews it-

self.\* You see then that this first Remark of yours is

to

\* Tho', I have given a Hint of it before, yet I cannot hinder myself from again observing in this Place the singular and exquisite Judgment of our Author, that in invoking or addressing Almighty God, he mentions such of his Divine Attributes as have a particular Relation to what the Psalmist is praying or addressing him for. Thus K. David Ps. iv. when under some very grievous Trouble, applies to God as the Sovereign Disposer of all Things, *O pater, O hominum divûmque æterna potestas.* In Ps. v. when persecuted by his Enemies, he betakes himself to God's Almighty Power for Deliverance, *O potens rerum Deus.* Under a deep Sense how highly he had provok'd the Divine Justice by his Sins of Adultery and Murder in Ps. li. he flies to God, as a merciful Saviour, ready and willing to pardon all those that with

true

to be read backwards, and to be understood in a Sense the very reverse of yours : Which gives us but a sorry Prospect of what we are to expect afterwards. For

2. You next tell us : " How often has God been stiled, " before we came to this Place, *rerum Dominumque patremque* ?" What do you intend by this, but to insinuate that *Buchanan* had but a poor Invention, which obliged him frequently to use the same Phrase ? That he names the *Sovereign Being* sometimes *Dominus*, sometimes *pater*, and sometimes *pater* or *parens rerum*, is very true. And by what Words or Epithets can God be more properly stil'd ? But I know no Psalm, either before or after this, where this whole Phrase *rerum Dominumque patremque*, are attributed to him. To accuse *Buchanan* of Barrenness either of Thoughts or Words is the most unjust Thing in the World. For I hardly know any Poet, that has a greater Flow and Variety of both than he. To instance in these only that relate to the *Deity*, how many different Ways has *Buchanan* of addressing or invoking Almighty God in this Book of Psalms, several of which your *Johnston* has borrowed from him, such as *Domine, Deus, pater, genitor ; potens rerum Deus, Servator orbis, Juste judex, Rerum certa salus, Custos gentis humanæ, Rector unice, Rerum sator, Salus humani generis, Bone rector orbis, Rex beate coelitem, Sancte custos hominum, Rerum conditor optime, Spes salutis unica, Princeps stelliferis altior orbibus, Rerum creator optime, Rerum sancte opifex, Dominator orbis, Salutis auctor & custos meæ, Salutis auctor unice, O salus rerum, O arbiter mundi, O arbiter mortaliæ & agminum cœlestium, O qui perpetuis orbem moderaris habenis, O sancte gentis nostræ protector, O rex omnipotens, Indulgens genitor, Nostræ spes una salutis, Tu bone*

true Repentance return unto him, in that most doleful and pathetick Strain, *O salus rerum, lacrymis precantum Mollibus flesti facilis*. And finally, in this lofty civ. Ps. wherein he is to celebrate the Divine Power, Wisdom and Goodness, he introduces it with a Commemoration of those his glorious Attributes, *Te rerum, Deus alme, canam Dominumque patremque*, where *DEUS ALME* respects his Goodness, *PATER RERUM*, his fatherly Wisdom and Care, and *DOMINUS RERUM* his sovereign Dominion and Power. I could show how far short Dr. *Johnston* comes of this in several Places.

\* While an Observer 106, where Dorick Diather. Nanagæis, dand usurpa

*vinc rerum conditor, O mi Deus unice, Rex, pater & Deus, Æterne rerum conditor, &c.* Is such a Variety as this, a Sign of one's labouring under a Penury either of Sentiments or Expressions?

3. Your 3d Quarrel is, "That *patrem* is insipidly followed by *Magne parens*." Not so, but most elegantly and appositely. He had said in the first Line, by way of Preface, that he was to bless God, *i. e.* to sing, or pen a Psalm to him, as the great Lord and Father of the Universe, in which he was to describe the Glories of his Power in creating, of his Wisdom in governing, and of his Goodness in providing for his Creatures, which are all considered as his *Off-spring*: Agreeable to which noble Thought he begins with this grand Exclamation, *MAGNE PARENS!* wherein, if I were to descant upon Letters and Syllables (as your Custom is) I could show that, besides what is in the Sentiment, there is something truly sublime in the very Sound of the Words. For the Letter *A* (which as I hinted before from Scaliger Poet. p. 521, is *litera grandisona*) is in the first Syllable both of *Magne* and *parens*.\* Here also we have the Pause or Stop, that you so much admire, on the *Trithemimeres* or third *Semiped*: As likewise, to give the Sentence a greater *πάθος*, and to render it more grave and solemn, we have the *Dactyle*, both in this and the next ensuing Line, followed by three flow Spondees: Besides, the Word *majestate* in this, both by its Length and Sound, has a real *Majesty* in it: Here we have a Cluster of exquisite Beauties, which you was not willing to own, but instead thereof simply tell us, "That the Versification of this Place, as it is not bad, so neither deserves it much Applause." But had these Lines been

T

John-

\* While I am speaking of this Letter *A*, I cannot omit mentioning an Observation of Mons. Rapin in his Treatise *de carmine pastorali*, p. 106, where he gives Theocritus the Preference to Virgil by his using the Dorick Dialect, in which this Letter *a* is more frequent than in any other. Nam, ut monet Demetrius Phalerens, *πλατρία λαλῶσι πάντα οἱ δωρεῖς*, diducto latoque ore loquuntur omnia Doræ. *Illud enim quod usurpare solent, vocalius longè sonantiusque est*, &c.



*Johnston's*, you would have wanted Words sufficient to extoll them.

4. Your 4th Objection is, " that *Ætheris æternas rector moliris habenas*, " is foreign to the Purpose." I own there is nothing of it directly in the Text, which *Egleſham* also made a Fault in *Buchanan*. To which it were sufficient to answer in *Dr. Barclay's* Words: *Huic versui in textu quod respondeat non est quidquam apertè positum. Sed ut nomen Jehovahæ toties repetitum in hoc Psalmo semel describeret multis notis, tandem vocat hic Rectorem; aut certè hoc versu illustrat ea verba*, *Magnificatus es vehementer*. To which I add, that if such Additions are blameable in *Buchanan*, they are at least equally so in *Johnston*, who has many such, and none of them more, severals of them less apposite than this is. Besides, if this Line of *Buchanan* displeases you, you may pass it, (the Sense being complete without it,) by putting the Point of Admiration after *verendus!* as is done in some Copies. However you may, yet I would not part with it in this Place for any Line that ever *Johnston* wrote. The last two Words *Buchanan* had from that of their common Master (as you call him) *Virgil*, — *manibus molitur habenas*. And, I hope, that is no Fault.

5. A 5th is, " that *Decor* is brought in betwixt *majest* and *gloria* merely for the Sake of the Metre." You might as well have said that every Word of the Line you are dissatisfied with is brought in between them. But the Truth is, that *Decor* hath nothing to do with *majest* two Lines before it, the Sentence being fully ended at the preceeding Line. — *Rektor moliris habenas*. *Buchanan* refers the Word *majest* to *magnificatus es vehementer*, as it is in the *Vulgate* and most other *Latin* Translations; for which our old *English* had, *Thou art become exceeding glorious*, and the new, *Thou art very great*. And what is *magnificatus*, but *majest* *præditus*, *ornatus*, or *majestatem adeptus*: For both come from *magnus*. Again, where our old *English* Version has, *Thou art clothed with Majesty and Honour*, and the new, *Thou art clothed with Honour and Majesty*, the *Latin* Translations

lations in *Buchanan's* Time had, *gloriam & decorem indutus es*, or, *Confessionem & decorem induisti*. So that *Buchanan* has exactly plac'd his Words in the same Order in which he found them in these Versions, *majestate verendus*, for *magnificatus vehementer*; and *decor* and *gloria*, for *gloria* and *decor*: With this Difference only, that he has put *decor* before *gloria*, as our last *English* Translation has put *Honour* before *Majesty*. And it was good for *Buchanan* he did so: For had he done otherwise, you would have brought him in guilty of an *Anticlimax*, (as you do on other Occasions, as in your *Suppl. p. 32*) for *gloria* is greater than *decor*, and therefore, according to you, should have been plac'd last: Tho' the *Orig.* has neglected it, as has also your *Johnston*, who has put *majestas* before *honos*.

6. Lastly you tell us, " That *Buchanan* has taken a great Part of the next Verse to make up this, and at the same Time has destroy'd half its Energy. How great a Difference is there between saying, *Thou cloathest thyself with Light as with a Garment*, and *Thou art cloathed with Light*, &c. In the latter Sentiment the Action ceases, and consequently the Verse languishes." What a delicate Niceness have we here? *Buchanan* has not made his Verses and those of the *Orig.* to end together! I have more than once told you before, that the Thing is impracticable; that *Johnston* has frequently done otherwise; and that the carrying the Sense from one Line to another, except it be in *Elegiacs*, is a great Beauty, and the contrary often a Fault. But what you say of *Buchanan* is not true of him in this Place. He has taken no Part of the next Verse to make up this. The 1st Verse, as it is distinguished from the 2d in our Bibles ends with, *Thou art cloathed with Honour and Majesty*; and in *Buchanan* with, *Te decor, auratis ambit te gloria pennis*. The 2d Verse in the former begins with, *Thou coverest thyself with Light as with a Garment*: and in the latter with, *Et circumfufum vestit pro tegmine lumen*. So that here there is not the least Encroachment made of one Verse upon another: But both are kept entirely separate, and the *Energy*, whatever that is, entirely preserv'd. I

must further add, that in the *Vulgate* the Verses are (and I think more naturally) otherwise divided than in our *Bibles*. For the 2d Verse in it is, *Confessionem & decorem induisti, amictus lumine sicut vestimento*: whereby this *Paludamentum Deitatis*, this his *Robe of State*, if I may so call it, is at once described, and his being *cloathed with Honour and Majesty*, and being *covered with Light as with a Garment*, are join'd together, as they are here by *Buchanan*.

As to the Difference you pretend there is betwixt *Thou cloathest thyself*, &c. and *Thou art cloathed*, &c. I do not see it. You tell us indeed, *That in the latter Sentiment, the Action ceases, and consequently the Verse languishes*. What you mean by the *ceasing of the Action* I understand not. The supreme *Being* is here represented as a glorious *King* putting on his Royal Apparel, and that in order as it were to make a publick Appearance. When this Apparel then is put on, the Action ceases, unless you suppose him to be always putting them on; which is absurd; and it seems no less absurd to think, that the Verse should languish because an Action is mentioned that naturally must be supposed in a short time to cease and be at an End. This trifling Cavil, is founded in this, that in the one, *Thou cloathest thyself*, God himself is mentioned as the Agent; in the other, *Thou art cloathed*, the Action only is exprest, without mentioning by whom it was done. And that surely is a mighty Matter! If this is a Fault, then not only our Translation in the preceeding Verse, but also your *Johnston*, are in the Wrong: For the one has, *Thou art cloathed with Honour and Majesty*, and the other, *Quem sacra majestas cingit & ambit honos*: And so likewise in *Pf. xciii.* *The Lord is cloathed with Majesty, the Lord is cloathed with Strength*. In all which the Agent or Cloather is not exprest: As neither seems it to be here in the *Vulgate*; which has *Amictus lumine sicut vestimento*, or, as others render it, *opertus* or *indutus*. To quarrel such Things as these, is *nodum in scirpo querere*, as the Proverb is, and worse than *ob male praesectum unguem stomachari*, as *Horace* expresses it. For here there is nothing but what is perfectly just, and worthy of the great *Virgil* himself:

T



*Te decor, auratis ambit te gloria pennis,  
Et circumfufum vestit pro tegmine lumen.*

You come in the End to speak of the Language of this Verse, and that it may not escape Scot-free, you find Fault with the most beautiful Word in it all, viz. *circumfufum*, which you say " is in the *Ovidian* Stile, " and that it is hard to say, that it adds any Thing to the " Sense." What do you mean by calling it of the *Ovidian* Stile? Is it because the Word is much used by *Ovid*? Or that he uses it idly, and when there is no Occasion for it? The Word certainly is in itself, not only harmless, but useful, and to be found in most Poets as well as *Ovid*. And if my *Index*'s do not deceive me, tho' he has writ more than any of the ancient Poets now extant, he has it only 5 Times, once in his *Fasti*, v. 582. *circumfufis fluminibus*, and 4 Times in his *Metamorphoses*, viz. i. 12. *circumfuso aëre*, iii. 180. *Nymphæ circumfusæ*, xiv. 354. *circumfusus satelles*, and v. 585 *circumfusa collo parentis Venus*. In all which Places every Body will see, that it not only adds to the Sense, but that the Sense would hardly have been complete without it. But what if the Word is to be found as oft in *Virgil*? In him it occurs no less also than 5 Times, once in his most perfect, and 4 Times in his most glorious Work, viz. *Geo.* iii. 368. *circumfusa corpora*, *Æn.* i. 590. *circumfusa nubes*, *Æn.* ii. 64. *circumfusa juvenus*, *Æn.* vi. 666. *quos circumfufos*, and *Æn.* xi. 546. *circumfuso milite*: In none of which is it more necessary to the Sense than in the above named Places of *Ovid*. You see what it is to throw your Bolts at random, without considering where they would light. But it adds nothing here to the Sense in Buchanan. With Submission, Sir, you are much mistaken. It not only adds to the Sense, but carries a singular Significancy along with it. For it imports that the *LUMEN*, or *Light*, which is here represented as Almighty God's *imperial Robe*, is not like other Robes, which generally ly close or near the Body, but like that of the *Sun* diffused in a vast Circumference round about him. You talk very much of the great *Virgil*, but had you considered him as you ought, you would have found him to have justified

*chanaan*, by a Line of his, as parallel to this as one thing can be to another. It is *Æn. i. 416.*

*Et multo nebula circum Dea Judit amictu.*

which *de la Rue* paraphrases, *Circumdedit multo tegmine nubis*, where he uses *Buchanan's* Word *tegmine*; and *Virgil's amictu* come pretty near in Sense to the Word of the *Orig. gnoteb*, which *Vatablus* renders literally *amiciciens se*. And to come yet closer, it is of this *Cloud*, that *Virgil* says afterwards, *circumsusa repente Scindit se nubes*, one of the Examples I mentioned before.

After you have done with this Passage of *Buchanan*, you come next to compare it with *Dr. Johnston's* Translation, where you tell us with a kind of Triumph, "That he " has judiciously avoided the Errors he saw in *Buchanan*." He saw! *Johnston* was so far from seeing such Errors, that he has very roughly chastis'd the Vanity (*Madness* he calls it) of *Dr. Eglescam*, for pretending to have found these and the like Errors. And were he yet alive, for as much as you admire him, he would be so far from thanking you, that nothing could more disgust him than the many ill-grounded Cavils you throw out here and elsewhere against that great Poet.

Well! but what are these Errors *Johnston* has avoided? Why " he begins with more than common Plainness, in order to rise the higher afterwards." This uncommon Plainness may be the Manner of Orators: It is not, I am sure, the Manner of Poets. What can be loftier than the Words with which *Homer* begins his *Iliad*, *Μῆνιν, ἄειδε θεὰ*; and *Virgil* his *Æneid*, *Arma virumque cano*, or his iii. *Georgick*, *Te quoque magna Pales*, &c. to which last this of *Buchanan* has a very near Resemblance.

You add " That this is the Reason, why he omits " the *Apostrophe* in the first Couplet, which is dropt in " the *Orig.* at the 3d Verse, and in several others after " it; To which *Buchanan* did not attend. *Johnston* avails himself of this Liberty, and reserves the *Apostrophe* to the 7th Verse." I told you before that it is a great Impropriety to call the addressing Almighty God in the second Person an *Apostrophe*; for that supposes him,

him, who is every where present, to be absent. But to pass that, was there ever a grosser Instance of Partiality than what you give us here? *Buchanan* follows the Original by addressing his Words (as in it) directly to God himself in the second Person: *Johnston* has no Address at all, but speaks of God in the third Person for six Verses together; and then and not till then directs his Words to God in the second Person. Therefore *Johnston's* Translation is preferable to *Buchanan's*! Which is, in other Words, that he that keeps closest to the *Orig.* is wrong, and he that wanders farthest from it is right. Yes: But the *Apostrophe* (as you falsely call it) is dropt in the *Orig.* at the 3d Verse, and in several others after it: To which *Buchanan* did not attend: And *Johnston* took an Advantage from that Change. *Buchanan* could not but see and attend to it, that in the *Orig.* of this and many other Psalms, the Person is frequently changed from the second to the third, and *vice versâ*. But he knew that such Changes were unusual in the *Latin* Idiom,\* and therefore has prudently all along in this Psalm address'd his Words to God in the second Person, till he came to the beautiful *Epiphonema* at the 31st Verse, *Sic eat*, &c. which allows and almost requires such a Change. But then he concludes his Address as he had begun;

*Te rerum, Deus alme, patrem Dominumque canemus.*  
But, because you provoke me to it, you'll allow me to animadvert a little on *Johnston's* Paraphrase of this 1st Verse. You say that he begins with more than common Plainness; that is, with a Plainness that is very unusual. And in this you speak Truth: For to me it is so plain

T 4

plain

\* This is so remarkable, that *St. Jerome*, who has made two *Latin* Translations of the Book of Psalms, and in one of them, has changed the third Person in the *Orig.* to the second, *regis, ponis, facis, tuos, fundasti*, &c. instead of *regit, ponit, facit, suos, fundavit*. And it being objected against, in his long Epistle to *Sunnia* and *Fretela*, he has these Words; *Si ergo omnia ad secundam personam sunt, id est, ad Deum: quomodo in uno versiculo tertia persona subito & extra ordinem inducitur?* And a little below: *Sed non potest, says he, aliud ad ipsum, aliud de ipso dici. Aut omnia quasi ad Deum loquebatur Propheta; aut omnia ad alium de eo referebat. Quum autem pleraque ad ipsum dirigantur, & ea, qua ambigua sunt, ad ipsius personam dirigenda sunt.*



plain, that it seems mean and flat, and very much below the Dignity and Sublimity of the Subject. In the *Orig.* it begins with a double Address (*Apostrophe* you would call it) first to himself, or his Soul, in order to rouse himself up to pursue the high and lofty Theme he was to go upon; and then he falls about it in a suitably glorious Strain, by directing his Speech to God, whose adorable Perfections he was to display in it, *Bless the Lord O my Soul: O Lord my God, thou art very great, thou art clothed with Honour and Majesty.* How infinitely short of this is, *Dicere fert animus superum nova carmina Regi, &c. i. e.* It hath come into my Mind to sing new Songs to the King of Heaven, (of the Gods you would have called it, as you translate *Divum* in *Buchanan* elsewhere.) You were ill advised in saying that *circumsusum* in *Buchanan* was of the *Ovidian* Stile, when I have shewed above, that it is rather of the Stile of *Virgil*: Whereas you have not adverted that almost this whole Line is of the *Ovidian* Stile: Who begins his *Metamorphoses* with *In nova fert animus*——*dicere.* And in the same 1st Book *Æ. 451 Rex superum*; which last Phrase is not in all *Virgil*; and the former, *Fert animus dicere*, is not in any Poet of the *Augustan* Age, except *Ovid*, that I know of.

Next, the *Quem* in the beginning of the *Pentameter* is too low and too little to supply the Place of *Thou art very great*, or *Magnificatus es vehementer*: And yet that is all we have for it: For, *sacra majestas cingit & ambit honos* do no more than answer to, *Thou art clothed with Honour and Majesty.*

Again, he is guilty of what you would make an *Anticlimax* in *Buchanan*, by putting *majestas* before *honos*, as I observed above.

Lastly, by his giving us two Words *cingit* and *ambit* for *cloathed*, he makes one or other of them superfluous. I mention these Things as *argumenta ad hominem* to you; (because you would have made them ring in our Ears, had you found any Thing like them in *Buchanan*;) and at the same time to shew that *Johnston's* Paraphrase is not so perfect as you give out.

(2.) By this Time we have got pretty clear thro' the first

first Verse, proceed we now to the 2d and 3d.

*Tu tibi pro velo nitidi tentoria cœli,  
Et liquidas curvo suspendis fornice lymphas,  
Et levibus ventorum alis per inania vectus  
Frénas ceu celeres volitantia nubila currus.*

in which, according to you, there is hardly one Word right. Your 1st Remark is "That *Buchanan* has entirely omitted that fine Thought, *who layeth the Beams of his Chambers in the Waters.*" Why? would you have these Words to be taken literally, as if God had really a Chamber supported or roofed with *Beams* in the Waters, and that these *Beams* were of *Ivory* too, as *Johnston* would have them, by calling them *trabes eburnas*. Every Body knows that is in the least acquainted with the Style of the Holy Scriptures, that it abounds with strong and hyperbolick Figures, a Style that was, and yet is, very common to those oriental Languages. But *Buchanan* not thinking these so proper in *Latin* Poetry, has given us, not that figurative, but the true Meaning of the Text; as has also in a great Measure the *Vulgate* Version, *Qui tegit aquis superiora ejus*, and not as others, who render it, *Qui contignat in aquis superiora sua*, or *Contignat in aquis cœnacula sua*. But, to clear up this matter yet farther, I must next observe, that you are very much mistaken, when you add "That the Divine Writer is here describing the Omnipresence of God: He *is in the Seas*, He *is in the Skies*, He *is in the Winds*, *all at the same time.*" The Psalmist had here no such Intention. His chief (if not only) Design was to celebrate the *Power, Wisdom* and *Goodness* of *God*, as manifested in his Works. And first (as *Dr. Patrick* and some other Interpreters observe) he begins with the *Heavens*, the *Clouds* and the *Winds*, or (as some will have it) *Angels*; and then comes down to the *Earth*, its *Hills, Valleys, Fountains, Men, Beasts*, and other inferior Things: But does not directly speak of the *Seas* till the 25th Verse, where particular Mention is made of them, and of the various Creatures in them. You have therefore quite miss'd the Sense of the *Orig.* when you fancy that by these Words, *Who layeth the Beams of his Chambers in the*

*the Waters*, is to be understood *the Seas*: When all Commentators I have read, agree, that by them are signified the upper *Regions* of the *Air*, where *watery Clouds*, *Rain* and other *Meteors* are suspended in the Form of an *Arch*: Which *Buchanan* is so far from omitting, that he hath no less justly than elegantly expressed them in those Words.

*Et liquidas curvo suspendis fornice lymphas.*

You subjoin here, in order to expose, as you fancy, *Buchanan* yet further, a literal Translation of his Words; and then add, "How little this resembles the *Orig.* the Reader will judge the better, when he has seen the other Translation particularly considered; which you also give us in *English* a little afterwards. But, in my Opinion, you have done Justice to neither. Among other things, I observe that you translate from *Buchanan*, *Tu tibi pro velo, &c.* You suspend the *Tents* of the clear *Heavens* as a *Curtain* for yourself; instead of, *Thou* (for we do not say *You* to Almighty God) *hangest up the Pavilion of the bright or radiant Heaven* (for *tentoria*, tho' in the plural Number, in which it is always used by the Poets, yet signifies only one *Tent*, *Tabernacle* or *Pavilion*) *FOR* (not *AS*) a *Curtain* or *Canopy* of *State* for (or to) thyself. And this perfectly agrees with *Bp. Patrick's* Paraphrase of the Words, "The spacious *Heavens* are thy Royal *Pavilion*, which thy sovereign Power hath extended like a *Canopy* for thy Majesty in this great *Palace of the World*:" And with *Tate* or *Brady's* noble Version,

*Heavens Curtain stretch beyond the Globe,*

*Thy Canopy of State to make.*

I might also take Notice, that *vectus* ought rather to be rendered *carried*, than *born*, as you have it, and *frenas* rather *Thou managest*, or *rulest as with a Rein*, than *You guide*. But these are things of small Moment; but your Translation of your own *Johnston's* Version is less fair. For 1<sup>st</sup>, You render *mœnia vasta*, *vast Limits*. Where ever did *mœnia* signify *Limits*? But this was to screen *Johnston* from an Impropriety, of which afterwards. 2<sup>dly</sup>, You render *astriferi poli*, too literally, *the Starry*

*Pole,*

*Pole,*  
*quen*  
*good*  
*trans*  
*Whi*  
*duasq*  
*of th*  
*them*  
*ther;*  
*fallin*  
*they,*  
*suppo*  
*Bu*  
*can*  
*sion*  
*John*  
*that*  
*self,*  
*ged*  
*have*  
*est ou*  
*nan*  
*but al*  
*most*  
*Wo*  
*ston's*  
*that*  
*prehe*  
*It seer*  
*vela,*  
*first*  
*Orig.*  
*byssus*  
*But th*  
*that th*  
*acting*

\* I:  
*Starry*  
*and not*



*Pole*, for *Starry Heaven*: For tho' *polus* in *Latin* is frequently used for the *whole Heaven*, yet the Word *Pole* in good *English* is never used so that I know of\*. 3dly, You translate *triumphales*, *triumphant*, for *triumphal*. 4thly, Which is worst of all, you translate *Pervolat Eoas occiduasque plagas*, *Flies over the rising and the falling Regions of the Heavens*, for the *Eastern* and *Western Regions* of them. The Sun indeed rises in the one and sets in the other; but 'tis the first time I ever heard of the *rising* or *falling* of the *Regions* themselves, but on the contrary that they, as the Northern and Southern Poles, are always suppos'd to keep the same invariable Position.

But to return to *Buchanan*, 'tis a Jest to tell us that we can judge better or worse how far *Buchanan's* Version resembles the *Orig.* by comparing it with that of *Johnston*. The only way of making a true Judgment of that Resemblance, is by comparing it with the *Orig.* itself, and the best Expositors of it. To these I am oblig'd only to appeal; and according to that Standard, I have the Boldness to affirm, that this Verse, *Who stretchest out the Heavens*, &c. is not only express'd by *Buchanan* in as elegant and poetical a manner, as is possible; but also that all the Thoughts of the Divine Original are most strictly and closely preserved in it.

Well, but to please you, let us compare it with *Johnston's* Translation, and upon Trial, I yet further contend, that *Buchanan* has vastly the Advantage. For, to my Apprehension, *Johnston's* is liable to these Exceptions. 1st, It seems too florid and affected. I do not like the *byssina vela*, or the *trabes eburnas*, or the *triumphales rotas*. The first may perhaps pass, tho' there is nothing of it in the *Orig.* because he does not say that these Curtains were of *byssus* or *fine Linnen*, but only that they were like them. But the second is hardly tolerable, for he says directly that these Beams were of *Ivory*; which is not only over-acting the *Orig.* but otherwise improper: For who ever heard

---

\* I am told indeed that *Milton* somewhere calls the *Heavens* the *Starry Pole*; but that is a *Latinism*, (of which that Author has severals) and not, I think, proper *English*.

heard of *Beams of Ivory*? The *triumphales rotæ* seem also improper. For the Intention of the *Psalmist* is not to represent God as *triumphing over his Enemies*; but only as *displaying his infinite Power and Greatness*. 2dly, He has changed the Phrases of the *Original*, who *maketh the Clouds his Chariot*, and who *walketh upon the Wings of the Wind*; in the former of which we have God described as being *carried in a Chariot*, in the other as *walking or riding*: Whereas *Johnston* turns both to being *carried in a Chariot*; or, which is worse, he represents Almighty God, first as using the *Clouds* for a *Chariot*, and then that he rode on the *West Wind*, and lastly, that he made a *Chariot* of the *East Wind*; for so the Word *jugales* must import. This is not only deviating from the Ideas of the *Orig*, but making superfluous Additions to them. But that which I am most dissatisfied with, is, *Explicat astriferi mœnia vasta poli*: For here we have two inconsistent Ideas join'd together, *Explicat* and *mœnia*; for *mœnia*, or *Walls*, being firm and inflexible things, are not capable of being *folded* or *unfolded*. This you yourself seem sensible of, by your translating it *vast Limits*, as I noted before.

From these Things you may see, Sir, what Ground you had for this strange Exclamation, "How absurd would it be to set about comparing this Passage with *Buchanan*? For can we find any thing equal to it in *Homer*, *Virgil* or *Milton*? especially the *Euris jugalibus*." 'Tis not to be wondred that *Johnston* should excel *Buchanan*, when the three greatest Poets that ever were, are not equal to him. But this, like many others, is nothing but pure Rhodomontade. For I think I have shew'd some Blemishes in this very Passage of *Johnston*, which *Buchanan*, far less *Homer*, *Virgil* or *Milton*, would not have been guilty of. The *Eurisque jugalibus*, I own, is a very elegant Phrase. But *equi jugales* is used by *Virgil*, *Claudian* and other Poets: And that here *Johnston* joins *jugales* with *Euri*, is owing to the original Word *Winds*; which Phrase the Heathen Poets could not use, since, according to their Mythology, most of their Gods had particular Animals which drove their Chariots.

But that nothing in *Buchanan* may escape you, you al-

so here fall foul upon his Language, and of it you say,  
 " that it affords a plentiful Harvest of useless Epithets,  
 " *nitidi cœli, liquidas lymphas, curvo fornice, levibus alis,*  
 " *volitantia nubila, celeres currus.*" At the Rate you  
 thus treat *Epithets*, there will be very few of them that  
 will be good for any thing. But I have, I think, clear'd  
 up that Matter above, p. 151, &c. and shall only add here,  
 that the best Authors use these or such like Epithets.  
*Virgil* has *altum* and *profundum cœlum*. *Ovid* *liquidum*  
 and *fulgens cœlum*. *Virgil* *liquidi fontes*, and *liquidi la-*  
*cus*. *Ovid* *inflexus lato curvamine fornix*, and *Virgil*  
*curvæ falces, curvæ puppes, curvæ carinæ, curvum cornu,*  
 (which are all as naturally crooked as an *Arch* is.)  
*Virgil* *levibus rotis, levibus sagittis, celeres alæ, pernici-*  
*bus alis, præpetibus pennis*. *Ovid*, *velocibus alis*. *Sta-*  
*tius, præpes alæ*. *Claudian, rapidæ alæ*. *Ovid, leves cur-*  
*rus*. *Tibullus, Levi currus*. *Ovid, levis sagitta, leves*  
*pennæ*. *Horace, volucrem currum*. *Ovid, celeres Noti,*  
*celeræ rotæ*. *Statius, alite currus*. *Virgil, dum nubila*  
*ventus agebat*. *Idem, Quà ventii incubuere, fugam dant*  
*nubila cœlo*. I wonder the more how you should quar-  
 rel such *Epithets*, since there are none of them that are  
*physical*, as your *Erythræus* calls them, or *essential* to their  
 Substantives, except *curvo fornice*; and yet *Quintilian*,  
 as I noted above, allows such in Poetry. For the *Hea-*  
*ven* is not always *nitidum*, bright or clear, nor *Water*  
 always pure and unmuddy, or *Wings, Clouds* and *Cha-*  
*riots* always swift. And to conclude with what ought  
 particularly to silence you, your own *Johnston* has sever-  
 al such *Epithets*; as *Pf. cxlvii. 17. liquidæ undæ*; *xlii.*  
*6. liquidis undis*; and *xliv. 6. Leves sagittæ*; *lix. 10. le-*  
*vibus pennis*; *lxxx. 4. levibus Notis*; *cxliv. 4. and cxlviii.*  
*3. levibus rotis*; and *cxlvii 4. volucres currus*.

(3.) Come we next to the 4th Verse,

*Apparent accinctæ auræ flammæque ministræ,*

*Ut jussa accipiant.*——

Upon which you have nothing to say, but " That it is  
 " easily perceiv'd that *Johnston's* Sentiment in this Place,  
 " which represents the *Angels* eagerly striving to execute  
 " *God's Commands*, very much excels *Buchanan's*, who  
 " only



" only makes them in a Readiness to receive the Almighty's Orders;" I am very much of a different Mind. *Buchanan* has said all that was just and proper, *Johnston* (as his Manner is) has too much exaggerated the Matter. Let us hear Dr. *Barclay* upon *Buchanan's* Words, *Non potuisset* (says he) *ipsum Latinum Latinius loqui. Ponderemus verba.* Apparent, *quàm propriè?* Apparitorum enim est adesse officii causâ. Accinctæ, *hec vox auget proprietatem præcedentis. Quàm oppidò paratæ sunt, quæ non solum apparent, sed accinctæ apparent?* As to *Johnston's* certant, I am so far from having that fine Opinion you have of it, that I hardly think it proper. There is no striving among these celestial Inhabitants, who shall be first or last employ'd; all of them being equally and constantly ready to execute the Will of their Maker. Besides I am no Admirer of the Phrase, which *Johnston* here and elsewhere makes use of for *Angels*, by calling them *Aligeri proceres.* Nay further, I am not sure if this is the original Meaning of the Text. I know that in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, it seems to be spoken of *Angels*; but the Commentators not being agreed about it, *Buchanan* did well to keep close to the Text.

(4.) Upon Verse 5th,

—Stat nullo mobilis ævo

Terra, super solidæ nitens fundamina molis,

Pollenti stabilita manu.—

to pass over what you talk of *Johnston's* Judiciousness in choosing *Elegiacks* for his Version, having spoke enough of that already; your Remark is, " That *Buchanan* is here too verbose: *Stabilita terra, non mobilis*, is much after the Manner of *Naso*; and so is *fundamina solidæ molis*, for *solida fundamina.*" But consider the Words better, and you will find no Foundation for these Cavils. He does not join *stabilita terra* and *non mobilis* together, as you do; nor are the Words to be ranged as you range them. He first says, *Stat nullo mobilis ævo terra*,—and then, as Dr. *Barclay* most judiciously observes, he gives two Reasons for it; 1<sup>st</sup>, Its own Gravity, poising it equally every way, *Nitens super fundamina solidæ molis*, which is not put for *solida fundamina*, as you affirm; for

that

that might insinuate as if it had another Foundation distinct from itself: But the *fundamina solida molis* is *fundamina sui quæ est solida mōles*, i. e. its whole self is, by that innate Principle it has of Gravitation, its own Foundation, which the *Vulgate* expresses *super stabilitatem suam*, and *Vatablus* or *Santes Pagninus* *super bases suas*; or as *Ovid*, (however much you condemn that noble Poet) no less truly than elegantly phrases it, *Pressa est gravitate sui*. His second Reason is, that it is *pollenti stabilita manu*, that it is so established by the powerful Hand of God, who has assign'd it its proper Place, and fixt it in it by the Gravitation of every Part towards its Center. *Pondere nixa suo* is very well in *Johnston*; but I am not so fond of *nullius præcipitanda manu*, as you are, who say that it is the Original itself; for that sounds a little, as if there were any Hand that might attempt it, as is reported to have been said by *Archimedes*, *Da ubi pedem figam, & terram loco dimovebo*. The Words are therefore well rendred by *Vatablus*, *Ne moveat se*; which is better than *Ne moveatur*, or *Ne præcipitetur*.

(5.) Follows Verse 6th,

—terra obruta quondam

*Fluctibus, ut fuso super ardua culmina velo.*

of which you say, (and it is much from you) "That it is in every respect truly poetical and strong." However, you add, "that it does not so fully or so naturally express the Sense of the *Orig.* as *Johnston*." I wish you had shew'd us where the Odds ly. I incline to think, if there is any, it is on *Buchanan's* Side. For, if this Passage refers to the original *Chaos*, mentioned *Genes. i. 2.* (as is the Opinion of the best Commentators, especially *Hammond* and *Patrick*) then *pelago* and *æquor* are not so proper as *fluctibus*.

(6.) On Verses 7th and 8th,

*Sed simul increpuit tua vox, tonitruque tremendo*

*Insonuere auræ, paulatim ascendere montes*

*Cernere erat, sensimque cavas subsidere valles,*

*Inque cavas valles trepidas decurrere lymphas.*

you say 1st, "As to the Translation it is not right, As soon as your Voice rattled, and the Air resounded with dread-

"dreadful Thunder. How much better is, *At simul intonnuit tua vox!* in *Johnston*." But may not *Buchanan's* Translation be right, tho' *Johnston's* is better? And wherein is his better? Because forsooth he has *intonnuit*, and the other *increpuit*. *Increpo* certainly is a good *Latin* Word, and much used by *Virgil*: And, as frequently in him it signifies, not only to rattle or make a Noise, but also with some Loudness of the Voice to rebuke, chide or blame;\* so here in *Buchanan* I understand by *increpuit tua vox*, Thy Voice did loudly reprove or rebuke them. But what puts *Buchanan's* Choice of the Word *increpuit* beyond all Dispute, is, that it is upon the Matter the very Word in the *Orig.* it being rendered in most *Latin* Versions, *Ab increpatione tua*, i. e. *cum tu vel tua vox eos* [fluctus] *increpuit*.

2. Your next Fault is in the *paulatim* and *sensim*, which you say do not come up to the *Orig.* What do you mean by not coming up to it? The Words indeed are not expressly in the *Orig.* at all. But they help to illustrate it, as being necessarily implied in the Nature of the thing: Unless you will say that this *real* Motion of the Waters descending, and the *apparent* one of the Mountains ascending were instantaneous; which no Body can well think. And the Word *cœperunt* in *Johnston* (which is as little in the *Orig.* as *paulatim* and *sensim*) supposes the contrary. You add, that the Sense is wonderfully expressed in *Johnston's* Words. It may be so: But I am pretty sure, that had *Buchanan* spoke them, you would have found several Faults in them. As 1<sup>st</sup>, That the second Line *Cedere jussit aquam, jussa recessit aqua*, is stoln from that trifling Poet *Ovid*: But of this afterwards. 2<sup>dly</sup>. The *Pater alme* is not a proper Address to *Almighty* God in this Place, for that signifies *Gracious* or *bountiful* Father, which is not apposite, when an *A&* of his mighty Power, attended with something that was dreadful,

\* See him, *Geo.* iv. 138. *Æn.* ix. 560. *Æn.* x. 900. and *Æn.* xii. 758. where *Ruans* explains *increpo* and *increpito* by *objurgo* or *incuso*. I might bring innumerable Places in other Authors, where the Word *increpo* is taken in that Sense.



ful, was to be express'd. 3dly, We have three Words signifying much the same thing, *montes, colles* and *juga*, which would not readily have been forgiven to *Buchanan*. 4thly, The last Line *Collibus incincta nubiferisque jugis*, (which you say does much embellish the Landskip) yet, as there is nothing to answer it in the *Orig.* had it been *Buchanan's*, it would have been accounted an idle Expletive, and brought in only to make up the Verse. 5thly, *Valles incincta collibus*, *Valleys girt about with Hills*, is a bold, and, I doubt, if justifiable, Phrase. (7.) But you are yet more hard upon *Buchanan's* 9th Verse,

*Neve iterum immissa tellus stagnaret ab unda;*

*Limitibus compressa suis resonantia plangit*

*Littora, præscriptas metuens transcendere metas.*

Where, comparing it with *Johnston's*, you say, "That you leave it to the Reader to determine whether any thing can be more perplext than *Buchanan's*, or more intelligible than *Johnston's* Translation." *Johnston's* Translation, I own, is plain and intelligible enough; and so will *Buchanan's* too appear to any Reader that understands the Language, if you will let him alone, and not perplex him with the ill-grounded Criticism you subjoin, viz. "That in *Buchanan* the Water is represented as fearing to transgress its Bounds, and yet beating imperiously against the Shore in order to transgress these Bounds." To shew the Emptiness of this Cavil, I hope, I need not tell you, that there is nothing more frequent and elegant in Poetry than to attribute humane Actions and Passions to inanimate Creatures: And here two of these Passions are ascribed to the Water, *Courage* and *Fear*, which, tho' contrary to one another, are very far from being so inconsistent, as you imagine. For there is none that is tolerably acquainted with the Humane Mind, who knows not that different, nay contrary Passions may take Place in it at the same Time. This is so true, that it very seldom happens that any one Passion so absolutely predomines in the Soul, that it carries not some Mixture or Alloy of its contrary along it. *Hope*, for Instance, supposes, in the very Nature of it, that it

U

has

has some Degrees, more or less, of *Fear* attending it. The same may be said of *Love* and *Hatred*, neither of which generally arise to such a Pitch, as to exclude all Degrees of its opposite Passion. Hence we have these and such like Expressions;

*Spe inque metumque inter dubii.*—

—*alternat spesque timorque fidem.*

*Speque timor dubiâ, spesque timore cadit.*

—*camque ira mistus abundat amor.*

And the same will equally hold, which is the Case before us, in *Courage*, which for the most Part has some Degrees of *Fear*, *Mistrust*, or, if you will, *Cowardice* mixt with it. Whence it was wittily said by one, *That every Man would be a Coward if he durst.* To apply this to *Buchanan's* Words, the Waters (which are represented as endued with Reason, Thoughts, Passions, &c.) may very well be said to beat impetuously on the Shore, as if they thought themselves able to get over it; and yet at the same time have some Degrees of *Fear*, that it will not be in their Power to effect it, because of the strong Barrier God has set to oppose them.

If this will not be sufficient to vindicate *Buchanan*, as I think it will; I have further to add, what will effectually do it, viz. that the Verb *metuo* is elegantly used for *cavere ne res fiat*, or *nolle ut fiat*, or simply *rem non futuram*, as in that of *Virgil*, *Geo. i. Arctos Oceani metuentes æquore tingi*, i. e. *caventes tingi*, or *non tingendas*. So *Horat. Od. iii. 11. Metuitque tangi Nuptiarum experti*, i. e. *non vult tangi*. So *Persius i. 47. Laudari metuum*, i. e. *nolo laudari*. And *Horat. Od. ii. 2. Pennâ metuente solvi*, i. e. *nunquam solvendâ*. And *ibid. Od. 14. Frustra per autumnos nocentem Corporibus metuemus Austrum*, i. e. *vitabimus, cavebimus*. See *de la Cerda* on the forecited Place of *Virgil*, and *Lambin* on that of *Horace*, *Od. ii. 2.* According to this Acceptation of the Word, *Buchanan's* Meaning is, that tho' the Waves of the Sea beat violently on the Shore, yet they take Care not to pass, or they will not pass the Bounds appointed for them. And this exactly agrees with that of *Jeremiah*, *v. 22. Fear you not me,—who have placed the Sand for the Bound*

of the Sea, by a perpetual Decree that it cannot pass it? and tho' the Waves thereof toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; tho' they rore, yet can they not pass over it? And with that of Job, xxxviii. 8 — 11. Who shut up the Sea with Doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the Womb? When I made the Cloud the Garment thereof, and thick Darkness a swaddling Band for it, and brake up for it my decreed Place, and set Bars and Doors. And said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud Waves [literally the Pride of thy Waves] be stayed. Which last Words are stronger than Buchanan's resonantia plangit littora. I hope, now, Sir, you understand Buchanan, and perceive that his Language is clear, poetical and scriptural.

(8.) Having got free of this, we go on to v. 10.

*Tum liquidi fontes imis de collibus augent*

*Flumina per virides undas volventia campos.*

Where you tell us 1st, "That in Buchanan's two Lines we have again two very unmeaning Epithets, *liquidi fontes* and *virides campos*". But Johnston's great Master Virgil has both these very unmeaning Epithets, Geo. ii. 200. *Non liquidi gregibus fontes, non gramina desunt.* And Geo. iii. 13. *Viridi in campo.* But no Matter; it seems, for that; Buchanan ought not to have had them. Why, might not Buchanan take a Lesson from that great Master, as well as Johnston? For even he has not scrupled to use the former of them twice in *Cantic: Solom.* cap. iv. and vi. — *Liquidi ceu fontis ab undis*; and I doubt not but he may have also the latter in some of his Works. I am sure he has many that are not so proper. From this we see, how far your Spite will carry you against Buchanan, when you can find in your Heart to have a Thrust at him thro' the Sides of your two dearest Friends. But, pray, what is it that so much offends you in these two Epithets? The first of them indeed Dr. Trapp has blam'd in the cxxxvii. Ps. where Buchanan has twice *liquida aquae*: But you yourself have absolv'd him from that Fault, for you tell us in your *Suppl. p. 32.* that *there* it certainly signifies *CLEAR*, and the only Fault you had to it, was, that it was again repeated in the same



Psalm. Here we have *liquidi fontes* but once; and if *Water* is any where to be had *clear*, it must be at the *Fountain-head*. *Purius ex ipso fonte bibuntur aquae* is what I suppose no one will question. And yet, even there, it may be *troubled* or made *muddy*: As *Narcissus* did a very clear one (as it is in the Fable) with his Tears, *Ovid Met. iii. 475*. As to the Objection against *virides* to *campos*, I ask, are the Fields always *green*? Or did you never see them otherwise in Winter? Nay, are there not some Countries so parch'd with Heat, that their Verdure is quite lost, even in Summer? And on the other Hand does not your Friend *Horace* speak of *pigri campi*, where there is no *aura aestiva* to make Trees flourish or look *green*? If these Things will not satisfy you as to the Justness of that Epithet to *campos*, I know no Use for the Word, and *Virgil* (not to mention other Poets) did very ineptly apply it, in saying *virides herbas*, *virides silvas*, *viridi fonde*, *viridi gramine*, *viridi cespite*, &c. for the Epithet is no more essential to *campos*, than to those other Substantives.

2. You have yet another Objection against *Buchanan* in this Verse; namely, "That the Action is wanting, "He does not say *Who* sendeth the Waters to run among "the Hills and the Valleys. This important Circumstance (you add) *Johnston* could not overlook." Why, forsooth, because he has *Tu jubes*? This Objection, if it is good for any Thing, should have been made before, in the preceeding Verse, where *Johnston* expresses the *Who*, *Buchanan* not. He must be a wonderful Poet indeed that can observe all your Punctilios. Several of these your *Johnston* himself has not observ'd in this Psalm. For where God is spoke to in the second Person, he speaks of him in the third. As in Verse 1st. *Thou art cloathed with Honour*, &c. *Buchanan* *Te decor*, &c. *Johnston* has *Se radiis — tegit*. And again *ψ. 6. Thou coverest it*, &c. *Johnston* *Illa — latebat*. Again, where God is spoken of in the 3d he uses the 2d as *ψ. 10. He sendeth the Springs*, &c. *Johnston* *Tu flumina*, &c. and *ψ. 13. He watereth the Hills*, &c. *Johnston* *Aetherio tu rore beas*. And so in several other Places. As to this Trifle

Trifle of Trifles, which yet you say is so important a Circumstance, that *Johnston* could not overlook it, even *Johnston* has overlook't it, not only in others, but in this very Psalm: For where in the Orig. God is mentioned as the *Who*, he has neglected it, as *Ps. 14. He causeth the Grass to grow*, *Johnston* has *Hæc pecori gramen—ministrat*. But it is wrong to say, as you do here, that the Action is wanting, and that the *Who* or Agent is not express'd. Is not *augent* an *Action*, and are not the *fontes* the *Agents* or *Doers* of it? "But God the great and principal Efficient Cause of all is not here particularly mentioned!" As if the whole Design of this Psalm was not to set forth that God was the great Almighty *WHO*, the first Author and original Cause of all the Actions and Operations of his Creatures; and that his infinite Wisdom and Goodness did direct and over-rule them all. And if it is a Fault to omit mentioning him as the prime Mover and Efficient of every Action recorded in this Psalm, then the Psalmist is more guilty of that Ommission, than either *Johnston* or *Buchanan*. See *Ps. 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26*. You see into what Absurdities you involve yourself by these your idle and ill-grounded Criticisms.

(9.) Proceed we to *Ps. 11*.

*Unde sitim sedent pecudes, quæ pingua tondent*

*Pascua, quique feris onager saxa invia silvis*

*Incolit.*—

On which you observe, "That *quæ pingua tondent Pascua* is brought in for the sake of the Verse only, and so undoubtedly is *feris* tacked to *silvis*. These Objections, you add, cannot be made to *Johnston's* Elegiac Lines." I answer, that this Objection, if there is any Weight in it, falls heavier on *Johnston* than on *Buchanan*. For, not to mention what of this Kind are to be met with in other Psalms, some of which I have taken Notice of above p. 21. where did he find *Per volat Eoas occiduasque plagas* in *Ps. 3. Et certant alacres, quo jubet ille, sequi* *Ps. 4. Collibus incinctæ nubiferisque jugis* *Ps. 8. the repentinis* *Ps. 9. stabili lege* *Ps. 10. apta fretis and co-*

*lubris*\* *ψ. 17. informi mole superstat aquas ψ. 26.* And more particularly where found he in this same Verse *silvas*, and *loca sola* and *feræ*? For none of all these are express'd in the *Orig.* Here we have only in general *Every Beast of the Field*, and the *wild Asses*. It by *Beasts* or *pecudes* are to be understood all *four-footed Animals*, *wild* and *tame*, there was no Occasion for adding *feræ*: For these are comprehended under that general Word. But if by *pecudes* are signified *Cattle* or *tame Beasts*, which I think more probable, as they are call'd the *Beasts of the Field*, and in Latin *bestiæ agri* or *agrestes*, I think Buchanan's *quæ pinguis tondent pascua*, is a must just Translation of it. For what are *bestiæ agrestes* or *agri*, but *Bestiæ quæ in agris pascuntur*? And what is that, but, *quæ pinguis tondent Pascua* in the poetick Stile? I hope you will not quarrel the Words, for they are all *Virgil's*. If it be said that under *wild Asses* may be comprehended other *wild Animals*, I shall not much dispute it. But why should *Johnston* (who keeps, as you pretend, so close to his Text) have taken them in, when not expressly named, or *Buchanan* be quarrel'd, when, tho' not here, yet elsewhere he takes the like Freedom.

As to your objecting against the Word *feris*, which you tell us is *undoubtedly tack'd to silvis for the sake of the Verse only*, I know not well what to say, till you explain your-

---

\* In these Words Verse 17. *Pullos Pascit & hic colubris nuncia veris avis*, there seems to be an Impropriety, namely, that in this Psalm, where the Goodness of God, and the tender Care that he takes of all his Creatures is especially commemorated, it does not seem fit that Acts of Cruelty, or that one Animal lives by the Death and Destruction of another, should be mentioned. This, tho' true, was far from the general Scope of the Psalmist in this glorious Hymn. Buchanan's *peregrina ciconia* is incomparably better in this Place. Why it is call'd *peregrina*, See Naturalists; from whom we learn other wonderful Properties of this Animal, particularly its singular Piety or Affection to its Parents, in feeding them when they are old. This had been vastly more proper to have been said of it here, as is elegantly done by Sir Thomas Reid in his Paraphrase of this Psalm, *Cuique piam credit sobolem erotalisfria pinus*. This singular Quality of that Creature is by the Greeks call'd *σφοδρὴ*, whence some derive the Word *STORK*, and those that want natural Affection are by the Apostle, *Rom. i. 31.* and others call'd *ἀσφοδρὸς*.



yourself more particularly. To guess at your Meaning, the Fault of it must be in one of these three Things; either that all *Woods* are *feræ* or *wild*, and therefore the Epithet is superfluous; or that no *Woods* are *feræ*, and then it is improper; or it must have no Epithet join'd to it, because *Johnston* here has none. The second and third of these are so absurd, that I dare say no Man will own them. As to the first, tho' it were true, I have shew'd above that it is no Fault in Poetry. But what if I should say, that some *Woods* are *not wild*, but such as may be frequented without any Danger; but others are so infested with savage Beasts or Robbers, that it is not safe to enter them? And that as *Buchanan* meant these last, which the *wild Asses* mentioned in the Text gave him Ground to do, so to distinguish them from the other, he added to these *silvæ* the Epithet of *feræ*? *Virgil*, I am sure, calls *montes feri*, in the same Sense, and for the same Reason.

(10.) Against the following Verse 12th you have several Objections. *Buchanan's* Words are,

— *hic levibus quæ tranant aëra pennis*  
*Per virides passim ramos sua tecta volucres*  
*Concelebrant, mulcentque vagis loca sola querelis.*

1st, You object, "That here again we meet with *levibus*, we had before *levibus alis*." This Objection seems double; first, that *levibus* is idly added to *pennis*, as before it was to *alis*; and secondly, that it is a Repetition of a Word said before. To both these I have spoken sufficiently already; only as to the last I add, that the Repetition here may be the more easily pardoned, as it is at the Distance of no less than eighteen Lines. I wonder that you do not here call *virides* an *unmeaning Epithet* to *ramos*, as you did before call it to *campos*; for certainly the Meaning of it was equally good or bad to both.

Your 2d Objection is against *concelebrant sua tecta*; for you say, "Whether to *celebrate* a House, for *inhabiting* a House, is good Sense, I will not pretend to determine." I think it will need neither an *OEdipus* nor an *Aristarchus* to determine the Point: For, from the little Knowledge I have of the *English* Language, I may venture to affirm,

firm, that to *celebrate a House*, for *inhabiting a House* is downright Nonsense. But it is not the *English Word CELEBRATE* we are concerned about, but the *Latin CONCELEBRANT*: And I am sorry to tell you, that here you have quite mistaken the Sense of the Word; which is the less excusable in you, as you had Mr. Love's Note, (for that you have seen his Edition of *Buchanan* will soon appear from what you say a little after in this very Psalm) but especially Dr. Barclay's *Judicium*, &c. or Vindication of this Psalm, to have set you right. From them, as well as from the common Dictionaries, you might have learn'd that the primary Signification of *celebro* and *concelebro*, is to frequent, to haunt, or often resort to a Place. Among a great many Examples, I shall only mention two, *Propert. i. 16. 3. Cujus inaurati celebrarunt limina currus*, i. e. *frequenter adierunt*. And *Lucret. ii. 344.*

*Et variae volucres letantia quæ loca aquarum  
Concelebrant circum ripas, fontesque lacusque.*

which last is so pat to the Purpose that nothing can be more.

3. You add 3dly, " That you could likewise have taken Notice, that *Hic* in *Buchanan* should have been "*Hæc circum*." Why so? Is it because *Johnston* has *Hæc circum*, and the Orig. *Juxta eos* [fontes] or *super ea* [loca]? But does not *Hic* adverbially taken signify the same Thing? As could be shown (were it necessary) in numberless Places of the best Authors.

4. You conclude 4thly, " And indeed the rest of the " Line, *levibus quæ tranant æra pennis*, is all in the puerile " Way." Where are we now? One of the finest and most heroick Lines that ever was wrote is reproach'd as silly and childish. Does it not much resemble that of *Virgil Æn. iv. 245. — et turbida tranat Nubila*, and that *Æn. x. 265. Strymonia dant signa grues atque æthera tranant*? In both which Places, as well as in *Buchanan*, that which properly belongs to Fishes, is by a beautiful Figure applied to Birds flying in the Air: And is much like to that of the same Poet, *Geo. i. 406. Quæcunque illa levem fugiens secat æthera pennis*.

(11.) Next follows the 13th Verse,

*Tu, Pater, aerios montes, camposque jacentes  
Nectare cœlesti saturas, fœcundaque rerum  
Semina vitales in luminis elicis oras.*

where you say, " That *aerios montes* and *campos jacentes* " in *Buchanan* is a mean Antithesis below the Dignity " of the Author." What Dignity? You have long since stript him bare of all Dignity, and done all that you could to prove that he does not deserve *Poeta salutari*. And yet here, because you thought, it seems, that you could not otherwise touch him, you allow him a very considerable Dignity, when such an *Antithesis* is judged to be below him; which yet, with all Deference to the Judgment of others, is not in my Opinion unworthy of *Virgil* himself.

You add, " That *Buchanan's Nectare cœlesti* is not " to be compar'd with *Johnston's Æthereo rore*." I think, on the contrary, if there is any Odds, *Buchanan* has it. The primary Signification of *Nectar* is *potus Deorum*; but it is frequently applied to other Things, as to *Honey, Wine, Milk*; and by *Ovid* sweet *Waters* are called *aque nectareæ*. Your *Johnston* also, *Cant. cap. 7.* has *Nectare lingua madet*, and *cap. 5. nectareas dapes*. There seems to be a remarkable Propriety in the Word here, that, as the Poets call'd the *Liquor* which their Gods drank, *Nectar*, so here the *Water*, i. e. the sweet *Showers* and *Dews*, that make the Earth to fructify, is said to be sent immediately from the Lord himself. *Ovid* has *nectare cœlesti*, as also *rore cœlesti*, which last your *Johnston* has taken from him, *Pf. cxxxiii. 3.*

What surprizes me most is, that you immediately subjoin, " That no more is the rest of *Buchanan's* three *Hexameters* to be compared with *Johnston's* Couplet," by which you mean that the latter has vastly the Advantage. But let Prejudice be laid aside, and I perswade myself, that, upon Examination, the Scale will be found to turn the other Way. As to the Poetry, I own that *Johnston's* Couplet, especially the last Line, runs very smoothly and elegantly. But *Buchanan's* three *Hexameters* have not only a greater Sublimity in them, but are vastly

(11.)



vastly more close and agreeable to the sacred Text than *Johnston's* Words are. The *juga confita dumis* in this last is very low in Comparison with *aerios montes*. For the Meaning of the Psalmist is, that not only the *lesser Hills* (for such only are these that are *confita dumis*, have *Bushes* or *Shrubs* growing on the *Tops* of them) but such also as raise their lofty Summits high in the Air, are watered with the Rains that fall upon them. Again the *Totaque cœlesti sub pede ridet humus*, tho' prettily express'd, is very remote from *The Earth is satisfied with the Fruit of thy Works*. i. e. *is made to fructify by these Showers of Rain thou pourest upon it*, or in *Buchanan's* Words, *Thou by these Rains drawest forth the fruitful Seeds of Things*, i. e. of Trees, Plants, Herbs, &c. into the Region of *Light*, or *Air*, in which they live, i. e. *vegetate and grow*. This noble Phrase in *luminis oras* or *auras*, he has borrowed from *Virgil's Sponte sua quæ se tollunt in luminis oras*, speaking of the Growth of Trees; and he again has taken it from *Ennius* and *Lucretius*. But why should I mention this or that Phrase? Let us rather hear what *Dr. Barclay* says, in a Rapture, of the Beauty of these Lines. *Certè hæc tria Buchananæ carmina plus habent eloquentiæ, plus materiæ, plus sapientiæ, plus arcane Theologiæ, quàm multa carmina Græcorum poetarum.*— *Examina, si placet. Aerios montes, quid dici potest altius? campoque jacentes, quid addi potest spatiosius? Nectare cœlesti saturas, hæc sapiunt nectar & ambrosiam. Fœcundaque rerum femina, quàm facundè? Vitales in luminis elicis oras: Quamdiu hic Sol lucebit, tamdiu hæc verba vivent, & volitabunt viva per ora virum.* You see from the Words of this most judicious Critick, how unlucky you are in your Comparisons; at least, how vastly different his Sentiments here are from yours.

(12.) Upon the 14th Verse, which we are now advanced to,

*Unde pecus carpat viridis nova pabula fœni:*

*Unde olus humanos geniale assurgat in usus.*

you renew your old Quarrel of the Repetition of the same Words, by telling us, " That this is but the third Place " where we find the Adjective *viridis* within the Com-

" pass

" pass  
" sho  
" dan  
ently  
ly hav  
pass o  
viridi  
cassion  
" is t  
Afr  
" Co  
" Pla  
" ly t  
hold,  
do not  
see wi  
he, wh  
the be  
could.  
Johnst  
His W  
ter hos  
certè h  
Poetæ  
pabula  
ex inte

(13.)

Q  
Q  
Q  
on wh  
" ed,  
" his  
can see  
be call  
poetica  
Oil, an  
not, th  
his Ver  
rison o

" pass of ten Lines, *virides undas* (*virides campos* you should have said;) *virides ramos*, *viridis fœni*, and *viridantis olivi* four Lines after." Which I have sufficiently vindicated above p. 268. & *seqq.* and particularly have noted this very Word repeated twice in the Compass of five Lines, in *Virgil's* 1st *Eclogue* v. 76 and 81. *viridi antro*, and *viridi fronde*. So that there is no Occasion for your insulting, as you here do." Such, say you, " is the Elegance of this fine Piece of Poetry."

After this foolish *Irony*, you add, " As for making a Comparison between *Buchanan* and *Johnston* in this Place, I cannot do it: He that does not see how vastly the latter excels, must be extremely blind." But hold, Sir, a little. People need not be blind, tho' they do not see with your Eyes. And if you will allow me to see with my own, I could almost adventure to say, that he, who talks as you do, seems not to be furnished with the best of Opticks. *Barclay* (though he does not, nor could, for they did not then exist, compare these Lines with *Johnston's*) has view'd them in a quite different Light. His Words (which you oblige me to quote) are: *Si præter hos versus nihil unquam Buchanani vidissem, assererem certè hæc esse & summo judicio viri, & maximo ingenio Poetæ carmen. Quàm Apolline digna sunt, viridis nova pabula fœni? quàm eleganter olus pro herba? & apponit ex interiore philosophia geniale.*

(13.) Next follows Verse 15.

*Quæque novent fessas cerealia munera vires,  
Quæque hilarent mentes jucundi pocula vini,  
Quique bilaret vultus succus viridantis olivi.*

on which you say, " Here again *Buchanan* is too diffused, and his *fessas vires*, his *pocula quæ hilarent*, and his *succus qui bilaret*, are in a very low Way." I can see no Reason imaginable why *Buchanan* should here be call'd *diffused*. Is not *cerealìa munera* a proper and poetical Phrase for *Bread*, and *succus viridantis olivi* for *Oil*, and *pocula jucundi vini* for *Wine*? And who sees not, that if he had said simply *panis*, *vinum*, and *oleum*, his Verses would have been flat and insipid, in Comparison of the Way he has express'd them. But it seems  
you

you cannot endure Epithets, because they lengthen the Verse, or, as you speak, render it diffused: Tho' I always thought them, when proper, among the chief Ornaments of Poetry. Because *Johnston* has no Epithet to *vires*, or *olivo*; was it unlawful to *Buchanan* to add *sesas* to the one, and *viridantis* to the other, than which none fitter could have been thought of? Nay this last *Johnston* judged so apposite, that he has not scrupled to borrow this whole Hemistich from *Buchanan* in his *Pf.* ii. 6. *Sacra meo Regi succo viridantis olivæ Tempora perfudi*, where he has *olivæ*, and so I believe it should be read here in *Buchanan*, not *olivi*, as all the Copies have it.\* In the mean time it is observable that *Johnston* in his second Line is as diffused as *Buchanan*, for there we have two Epithets, *tristia* to *corda*, and *dulci* to *mero*.

As to the *pocula quæ bilarent*, and the *succus qui bilaret*, which you say are in a very low Way: To my Taste, or (to use your former Metaphor) Sight, the Matter appears quite otherwise. For in my Judgment the Lines are not only high and lofty, but there is moreover a peculiar *Venustas* or Gracefulness in them, in these *Anaphora's* or *Repetitions* of the Words, *Quæ, quæ, qui*, and *bilarent, bilaret*. If these are in a low Way, then one of the most beautiful Figures either in Oratory or Poetry must be discarded. You yourself, in your Notes, can on other Occasions highly commend these *Anaphora's* in *Johnston*, as particularly *Pf.* ix. i. and you might also have taken Notice of it in the Verse before this, *Hæc pecori, Hæc homini*, which very much resembles *Buchanan's Unde pecus* and *Unde olus*. But that would not have answered your Purpose here, it seems; when *Buchanan* was to be blam'd for that Piece, as you now reckon it, of low Wit. For the same Reason perhaps it

was

\* *Virgil* *Æn.* v. 494. gives it the same Epithet, — *viridi Mnæstheni evinctus olivæ*, and (which is more) *David* resembles himself to a green Olive, *Pf.* lii. *virens olivula Buchanan* has it; *Johnston* simply *olivæ* insar. I should add, which particularly shews the Justness of the Epithet, that the Olive Tree is an ever-green, or, as your Author's Name-take Dr. *John Johnston* of *Rosfoch*, in his *Dendrographia*. p. 249. calls it, *Arbor perpetui viroris*.



was, that you omit to mention it as a Fault in *Buchanan*, that he has inverted the Order of the *Orig.* by putting *Bread* first, which is there last: But you was aware that *Johnston* has taken a yet greater Liberty, by using a more retrograde Order, *Bread, Oil, Wine*, instead of *Wine, Oil, Bread*. Tho' I believe there is no Harm in the Matter in either Poet.

(14.) On Verse 16.

*Nec minus arboribus succi genitabilis humor*

*Sufficitur: cedro Libanum frondente coronas,*

you only say, "In the former Verse we had *succus olivi*, "here we find *humor succi*." What then? Where is the Fault, unless in the Repetition of the Word, of which we have said enough elsewhere?

(15.) But on Verse 17.

*Alitibus nidos: abies tibi confita surgit,*

*Nutrit ubi implumes peregrina ciconia factus,*

you make a terrible Bustle. "The great Difficulty, you say, in *Buchanan's* Translation is to determine what *Alitibus nidos* belongs to in Grammatical Construction. His Interpreter is of one Opinion, his Annotators are of another. The former [i. e. *Tule* in his *Ecphrasis*] would have the Word *ad* understood; the others [i. e. *Mrs. Hunter* and *Love*] cry out against this Interpretation, and explain *nidos*, *per appositionem sublucentem* (by a Kind of glimmering Apposition) to relate to *Libanum*, id est, in chaste Latinity, *Libanum nidos alitibus*." It is no Wonder, that this Passage in *Buchanan* (which, I confess, has some Difficulty in it) should puzzle you, when you mistake the Meaning both of his *Interpreter* and *Annotator*. For the learned Annotator, *Mr. Hunter*, tells us, That the Construction at first View would seem to be, *coronas, i. e. stipas et opples nidos avibus*, and he adds, *nec prorsus ineptè, Virgil Æn. 9. 380. omnemque abitum custode coronant*. But he immediately retracts it: For he subjoins, *Reclamat autem codex sacer & Julius, monentes hunc sensum, Libano imponis coronam, ramis frondentibus cedros, volucris habitacula, per appositionem sublucentem*: Which last Words you translate by a Kind of glimmering

Ap-

*Apposition.* By these Words it is plain, that the Interpreter and Annotator perfectly agree in Opinion as to the Grammatical Construction of this Passage. The former indeed (who is generally too verbose in his *Ecphrasis*) has the Word *ad* before *habitacula*: But that is added to make the Sense clearer, and not at all to shew the Construction; which, according to both the Interpreter and Annotator, is an *Apposition*; and the latter calls it *sublucem*, because at first it does not appear observable enough to every Reader. As to the Latinity of *Libanum* and *nidos* being join'd together by that Grammatical Figure, you have no Reason to condemn it, as you do, by calling it ironically *chaste*, supposing, as you did before, that in *Apposition* the two Substantives ought always to be of the same Number; the contrary whereof I have shew'd above, p. 281. I shall only add, that you seem not to have sufficiently considered the Nature of that Figure: For all the best Grammarians, *Priscian*, *Sanctius*, *Perizonius*, your own *Linacer*, &c. agree that there is an *Ellipsis* in it, i. e. that *ens*, *existens*, or the Greek *ἔν* is understood. So that the full Construction of these Words, — *cedro Libanum frondente coronas Alitibus nidos*, is, *Tu coronas*, i. e. *vestis* or (as *Yule* phrases it) *circumcirca cingis Libanum frondente cedro, existentem nidos alitibus*, i. e. *qui Libanus cum frondente cedro, vel frondente cedro coronatus, alitibus nidi sunt*: Where *Libanus frondente cedro coronatus* is to be taken collectively for *cedri frondose in Libano crescentes*.

(16.) Proceed we to Verse 18.

*Tu timidis; montes damis; cava saxa dedisti,  
Tutus ut abstrusis habitaret echinus in antris.*

where you say, "Here *Buchanan*, for the Sake of his " Verse, has taken leave to alter the Sense of the *Orig.* " and has turned *Wild-Goats* into *Hedge-Hogs*." *Buchanan* was not such a Poet, or so straitned in his Verse, as that for the Sake of it he should alter the Sense of the *Orig.* If that has happened, as sometimes it has, to *Johnston* as well as him, it proceeded from another Cause. But here you are doubly in the Wrong to *Buchanan*. For 1<sup>st</sup>, That Alteration, if it is one, is not in turning *wild-Goats* into

into  
I an  
fy A  
W  
has  
bus  
Vat  
the  
Ge  
ma  
cap  
righ  
far  
mor  
rim  
whi  
mun  
Tra  
dete  
(wh  
chan  
(an  
inve  
first  
the  
has  
wou  
Mar  
wou  
in B  
(1

you  
" ch  
" P  
you  
za, f  
Dr.

into

into *Hedge-Hogs*; but in turning them into *dama*, which, I am sure, whatever else it may signify, it does not signify *Hedge-Hogs*. But that is not all: For 2dly, *Buchanan's* Words exactly answer the *Orig.* The *vulgate Latin* has *Montes excelsi cervis*; *Pagninus*, *Montes excelsi ibicibus*, which is the same with *rupicapris*, or *Wild-goats*. *Vatablus* following the *Jewish* Commentators interprets the Original Word *Lemognadim*, *damis*, *rupicapris*: and *Gesner* in his *Hist. Animal. lib i. p. 334.* from *Pliny*, maintains that the proper Signification of *dama* is *rupicapra* or *Wild-goat*. So that *Buchanan* is absolutely right here. As to the other Word *echinus*, he cannot be far wrong. For the best Copies of the lxxii, as *Hammond* observes, have *χοιεργυλλίαι*, and the *Vulgate* *herinaceis*, both which are the same with *echinis*: For which other *Latin* Versions have, some *leporibus*, others *muribus*, and some *cuniculis*, or *conies*, as it is in our Translation. Let such as are Criticks in the Language determine which are preferable. But what if *Johnston* (who you say here follows the *Orig.*) is faulty, when *Buchanan*, as I have prov'd, stands *rectus in curia*? For 1st, (and I believe it was for the Sake of the Verse) he has inverted the Order of the Words, by naming the *Conies* first, and the *Wild-goats* last, contrary to the Order of the Text. 2dly, Instead of *ibex*, *rupicapra*, or *dama*, he has *capella*, that is, a *tame* instead of a *Wild-goat*. I would not have mentioned these (which are, upon the Matter, but *Peccadillo's* in him) but that I know you would have made them gross and unpardonable Faults in *Buchanan*.

(17.) On the 19th Verse.

*Tu Luna incertos vultus per tempora certa  
Circumagis: puroque accensum lumine Solem  
Ducis ad occiduas constanti tramite metas.*

you 1st ironically tell us, "That we have now in *Buchanan* another pretty Antithesis, so proper in sublime Poetry; *incertos vultus* and *certa tempora*." I wish you had told us, what makes these *Antitheses*, or *Antitheta*, so improper in sublime Poetry. I think your Friend *Dr. Trapp* is of another Mind. He says of them, *Prælect.*



10. p. 224. *Inter multa, quæ doctorem opera honestant, sive prosâ sive versibus exarata, perpaucâ tantum invenimus Antithetis venustiora. Cujus rei in propatulo causa est; nimirum quod contraria inter se collata se invicem commendent, sibi que invicem lucem offundant.* And he sub-joins two Examples of them; the first, from a very sublime Poem, *Æn.* iv. 93.

*Una dolo divum si femina victa duorum est.*

The second, in *stylo mediocri*, *Ovid. Met.* iii. 654.

*Si juvenes puerum, si multi fallitis unum.*

But, if these won't please you, take you that of the same sublime Poem: Where we have two of these *Antitheta*, and one of them the very Words you here quarrel, *Æn.* ix. 95.

*Mortaline manu facta immortale carinæ*

*Fas habeant? certusque incerta pericula lustræ*

*Æneas? ———\**

But I see nothing in *Buchanan* will please you: And of this you give us a new but a very odd Proof, for you immediately add, "As to the next Line,—*puroque accensum lumine Solem*, take but away the Word *Solem*, and "we may as well read—*patulæ recubans sub tegmine fagi*. What a wretched expletive Sentence is that—" *puroque accensum lumine!* And this in a Writer who "takes the Liberty to run one Verse of the Original in-  
"to another; and in the Metre which he chooses for his  
"Translation may stop short or advance just as he pleases." Oh me! What shall I say or think after this, when the most excellent Things are made the worst? When proper Epithets, and lively Descriptions, when beautiful Images, and figurative Allusions (which are the very Soul of Poetry) are called wretched Expletives? What Jargon is it to say, *Take away Solem*, and we may as well read—*patulæ recubans sub tegmine fagi?* For what is that but

\* What a Gracefulness, and I may say Dignity, these *Antitheta* afford, not only in Poetry, but also in Oratory, we have discovered in a large Treatise on the Subject, by the learned Italian *Aug. Gambarelli*, printed at Milan in the 1606. 4to. with this Title, *Oppositorum quæ Augustinus Gambarellus Mediolanensis à Plauto, Terentio, Casare & Cicerone collegit, Liber, humaniorum literarum studiosis præcipuè utilis.*

but to say, Take away the Substantive, the Subject we are speaking of, and the rest will make no Sense? May not I as justly say, *Take away the Word Sol from that of Johnston,*

*Sol jubar Hesperiiis, te duce, mergit aquis;*  
and we may as well read——*Trojae qui primus ab oris;*  
that is, it will be Nonsense?

If it be said that *puro accensum lumine* is not in the *Orig.* I answer, as little is *rapidis bigis* in the first, and *Hesperiiis aquis* in the second Line of *Johnston's* Couplet; which therefore must be wretched Expletives in him as well as the other; to pass the Exception I have to *bigis* mentioned above, p. 28. How absurd is it then to blame *Buchanan* for what *Johnston* is equally guilty of; nay to blame either of them for that which in both is a great Excellency, and inseparable from true Poetry? For, to come closer to the Point, does not the Original, *The Sun knoweth his going down*, import, that that great Luminary has by the divine Providence a regular and determined Motion appointed him? Or will you say, that by the Words, *knoweth his going down*, is meant only that *he knows when to set*, without its being necessarily imply'd that *he knows also* (to continue the Figure) *when to rise, and to pursue his Journey through the Day in a certain fixt time.\** And what Poetry could better describe this, than

—*puroque accensum lumine Solem  
Ducis ad occiduas constanti tramite metas.*

The Phrase *accensum lumine* is taken from that of *Virgil*, speaking of *Venus* or the *Evening Star*,

*Illic sera rubens accendit lumina Vesper;*  
and is a *Simile* borrowed from the lighting of a Lamp or Candle: And it is perhaps in Allusion to the Light of the Sun, that *Job* says xxix. 3 *When his [i. e. God's] Candle shined upon my Head, and by his Light I walked thro' Darknes;* as *Virgil* oftner than once names it *Phœbea lampas.*

X

\* That the *Rising* of the Sun is here also signified, is so obvious to common Sense, that it was hardly needful in *de Muis* to add this Note, *Quod porro de occasu ait, dem de ortu est accipiendum.*

*lampas*. It is moreover observable, that *Buchanan* does not say *Sol accendit lumina*, as *Virgil* does *accendit lumina Vesper*, but *accensum lumine*, signifying thereby that this glorious Light was not self-existent, but the Effect of God's Almighty Power and Goodness. And finally, if these three Words *puro accensum lumine* must pass for a wretched expletive Sentence, what must become of your own *Johnston's Aurea qui rutilis accendit sidera flammis*, Ps. cxxxvi. 8. in which he has imitated *Buchanan* Ibid. *Qui vitreo accendit flammantia lumina cælo*? And what further must become of these much larger Descriptions of the Sun's Rising in *Virgil*,

*Postera Phœbeâ lustrabat lampade terras,  
Humentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram.*

And, *Qualis ubi Eois Phœbus caput extulit undis,  
Sole recens orto.*——

And, *Postera vix summas spargebat lumine terras  
Orta dies, cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt  
Solis equi, lucemque elatis naribus efflant?*

"What a Number of idle Expletives have we here?"  
"What need was there for spinning out a Thought, as you express it, in two or three Lines, when as many Words, *Sol ortus erat*, or *Dies illuxerat*, would have sufficed?" This I take to be the plain Consequence of your Doctrine; and let *Virgil*, *Horace*, and all the Tribe of Poets see to it. And lastly, and to crown all, what must become of that yet more copious and truly sublime Description of that glorious Luminary Ps. xix. 4, 5, 6. *In them hath he set a Tabernacle for the Sun, Which is as a Bridegroom coming out of his Chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong Man to run a Race. His going forth is from the End of the Heaven, and his Circuit unto the Ends of it: And there is nothing hid from the Heat thereof.*

As to what you add, "of *Buchanan's* having taken the Liberty of running one Verse of the *Orig.* into another, and that thereby having it in his Power to stop short or advance as he pleased," he might the more easily have avoided those idle Expletives. I answer that this Liberty is common to all good Poets with *Buchanan*, and is so far from being faulty and licentious, that the

con-

con-  
have  
you  
I ha  
of t  
(I  
you  
"ch  
"lik  
thing  
and  
ther,  
circu  
give  
2.  
pear  
Per t  
resem  
bove  
ged th  
Word  
them:  
the W  
fore fa  
lentia p  
or here  
Earth:  
the W  
had you  
Sea; an  
Earth,  
nished,  
(19.)  
Ta  
Pi  
Au  
Te  
of whic



contrary would render the Verse dull and tasteless, as I have shewed above. But be that as it will, the Words you complain of are no idle Expletives; but (as I think I have now made out) proper and pertinent Illustrations of the Subject.

(18.) On Verse 20.

*Inde superfusus cuncta involventibus umbris,*

*Per tacitas spargis nocturna silentia terras.*

you object, 1st, "That in the first of these Lines of Buchanan, *superfusus* and *involventibus* are pretty much alike," i. e. as I understand you, *signify much the same thing*. This I absolutely refuse, their Signification here and every where else, differing as much from one another, as that of *superjacio*, *superpono*, *supersterno*, do from *circundo*, *cingo* or *ambio*: Of which it would be idle to give Examples.

2. Your 2d Objection has, I own, some greater Appearance of Reason in it: For in the following Line, *Per tacitas spargis*, &c. *tacitas* and *silentia* very much resemble other in Signification. But I have shew'd above p. 156. that the best of Poets have frequently indulged themselves this Liberty of using Epithets or other Words much the same in Sense, with those joined with them: But then they always took Care that the Sound of the Words should be very different. It was not therefore fairly done of you to translate *taciti tranquilla silentia ponti*, Pl. cvii. 29. *the quiet Silence of the silent Sea*; or here, *Per tacitas*, &c. *the nightly Silence of the silent Earth*: Where, in order to ridicule Buchanan, you make the Words to agree both in Sound and Sense. Whereas had you translated the former, *The calm Silence of the quiet Sea*; and the latter, *A nightly Silence through the quiet Earth*, the Force of your Objection had very much evanished, if not quite disappeared.

(19.) But let us go forward to Verse 21.

*Tum fera proripit latebris, silvisque relictis*

*Prædator vacuis errare leunculus arvis*

*Audet, & è cœlo mugitu pabula rauco*

*Te patrem exposcit:*

of which you say 1st, "That in this Place Buchanan

X 2

" has

“ has three Hexameters and an half, *Johnston* his usual  
 “ Distich. The Reader (you continue) cannot but per-  
 “ ceive, what it is increases the Bulk of *Buchanan's* Pa-  
 “ raphrase; *è cœlo, vacuis arvis, mugitu rauco.*” Here  
 are mighty Discoveries! *Buchanan* has more Lines than  
*Johnston*, and many Words take up more Room than  
 few! Is Poetry to be mete with Ells, Spans or Inches?  
 And is that always best, that is of the least Measure?  
*Buchanan* has *è cœlo, vacuis arvis*, and *mugitu rauco*?  
 And what of that? Are not these Words proper and poe-  
 tical, beautifying and heightning the Thought, as you say  
 of such Words when they occur in *Johnston*. But, you  
 add, “ What a Difference is there between that *rauco*,  
 “ and *Johnston's suplice.*” I agree with you, that there  
 is a considerable Difference between them: But the Ad-  
 vantage is not on *Johnston's* Side, as you fancy, but on  
*Buchanan's*. For 1<sup>st</sup>, The *rauco* better answers the o-  
 riginal Word *roar*. And 2<sup>dly</sup>, It is a most proper Epi-  
 thet to *mugitus*, as in that of *Ovid. Met. xiv. 409.*

*Et lapides visi mugitus edere raucos.*

And *Fast. i. 560.*

*Mugitum rauco furta* [i. e. boves furto ablata] *de-  
 dere f. no.*

But *suplice* seems an aukward Epithet to *mugitu*: At  
 least I know no good Author that uses it.

You next add, “ That there is again a Difference be-  
 “ tween *Buchanan's leunculus* and *Johnston's soboles ani-  
 “ mosæ leonis.*” I see none, unless that *Buchanan* expres-  
 ses in one Word, what *Johnston* takes three for: Which  
 Conciseness you elsewhere much commend in *Johnston*;  
 and had the Tables been turned, you would probably  
 have done so here, and told us that *animosæ soboles* was  
 in a low Way, as you said of *Buchanan's fessas vires* in  
*ψ. 15.* both Epithets being equally good and proper.

You conclude with saying in an ironical Tone,  
 “ What a noble Description have we here in *Buchanan*  
 “ of the Courage of this young Lyon,

“ —*vacuis errare leunculus arvis Andet,*

“ He dares to wander in the lonely Fields?”

Does not *Johnston* call him *animosæ*; and does not that  
 imply

imply *Courage*? Where is the Fault then of *Buchanan's* *audet*? which probably gave the Hint to *Johnston's* *animosa*: For nothing is directly said of that *Courage* in the *Orig.* Is not *Magnanimity* and *Boldness* the most distinguishing Quality of the Lion? And was it not *Courage*, a very early *Courage* in this young Lion, when he was no sooner wean'd, *Fulvæ matris ab ubere jam lacte depulsus*, as *Horace* nobly expresses it, but he had the Boldness to leave the Woods, and venture himself into the open Fields; tho' in the Night time, when he was most secure from Danger? For, as *Vatablus* comments upon the Place, *Rugiant*, (says he) *subaudiendum aliquid*, *Tunc etiam rugiant, per noctis tenebras sciz. Dicit etiam leones non audere progredi interdiu, nisi vehemens urgeat fames.* From this it appears that it was no small *Courage* in the young Lion, thus to dare to leave his Den, when he was as yet but young and comparatively weak, and the old Lions durst hardly do more. To blame then *Buchanan* for the Word *audet* is the most unjust thing in the World. As to *Johnston's* Version, I think it faulty in this, that tho' he calls him *soboles animosa leonis*, yet he seems to detract from that *Courage*, by the *supplice* and *poscit opem* that follow. And I much doubt if every Reader would take *poscit opem* for *seeking Meat*, that generally signifying to *seek Help*, as *Gellius's* Lion did, when he had a Thorn in his Foot, which he wanted to be taken out. But to return back a little to the Complaint you here and elsewhere make of *Buchanan's* being too diffused, I would advise you to read *Virgil*, (whom you constantly call *Johnston's* great Master) over again: For you will find him much more diffused, especially where any Passion, as of *Courage*, *Fear*, *Grief*, *Pity*, &c. is to be much raised, and as it were animated by the Description. I shall, of innumerable such, only instance two Passages, and both relating to the Lion, as in the Place now before us. The first is *Æn. x. 723.*

*Impastus stabula alta leo ceu sæpe peragrans*  
*(Suadet enim vesana fames) si forte fugacem*  
*Conspexit capream, aut surgentem in cornua cervum,*  
*Gaudet bians immane, comasque arrexit, & hæret*



*Visceribus super accumbens, lavit improba teter  
Ora cruor.*—— The second is *Æn.* xii. 4.

—— *Pœnorum qualis in arvis*

*Saucius ille gravi venantum vulnere pectus,  
Tum demum movet arma leo; gaudetque comantes  
Excitans cervice toros, fixumque latronis  
Impavidus frangit telum, & fremit ore cruento.\**

Had *Buchanan* wrote thus, how would you have cried out, What a Waste of Words here, and how many idle Expletives, when he has taken five Lines to express what *Johnston* could have done in two, and perhaps in one? But had *Virgil* done so, how many of the charming Beauties that we find in these Lines, would have been lost?

(20.) We have now got to Verse 22.

—— *Dein rursus sole renato*

*Abditur occultis prædatrix turba cavernis.*

where you object 1st against *rursus*, which you say is a mere Expletive. *Eglesham* had made the same Objection before, and *Dr. Barclay* (whom it had been worth your while to have consulted, before you renew'd it) has effectually refuted it, by shewing 1st, That *rursus* is not to be join'd with *renato*, as you and *Eglesham* fancy it is; but that the Construction is, *Dein, sole renato, prædatrix turba rursus abditur.* And 2dly, That though we should allow him to have said *rursus renato sole*, yet such a *Pleonasm* is very frequent with the best Authors; of which he gives several Examples, and *Eliás Major, de varianda oratione, lib. v. sect. 9. p. 550, &c.* gives a great many more. I conclude therefore with *Dr. Barclay, Nugari est his nugis respondere.*

2. You next tell us, "That *occultis* is also a mere Expletive to *cavernis*." What think you then of *cave cavernæ* in *Virgil*, and *curvæ cavernæ* both in him and *Lucan*; and *cæcæ cavernæ* in this last? These being more constant and natural, than *occultæ*. For most *Caverns* or *Dens* are hollow, crooked and dark; whereas there are a great many that are not *hidden* or *secret*. Besides there seems

---

\* In the first of these Examples, the *peragrans* answers to *Buchanan's errare*, and in the 2d *impavidus* to *audet*.

seems to be a particular Reason for that Epithet here, because wild Beasts chuse to have their *Dens* or *Lurking Places* as *secret* and removed from common Sight as they can.

3. *Lastly*, You have a Wipe at the Repetition of *prædatrix* after *prædator*. For which see what we have said above p. 268. & *seqq.*

(21) Follows Verse 23.

*Inque vicem subeunt hominumque bouumque labores,  
Donec sera rubens accendat lumina Vesper.*

on which you say 1st, "Here again we have more of "*Buchanan's* Patch-work—*hominumque bouumque labores* is not the Sense of the *Orig.* but taken from *Virgil* merely to make out the Verse." What! not the Sense of the Original! What can better express these Words, *Man goeth forth to his Work and to his Labour*, than *Inque vicem subeunt hominumque bouumque labores?* i. e. *The Labours of Men and Oxen succeed or come on in their Turn*, that is, *after these ravenous Beasts have betaken themselves to their several Dens*. 'Tis true the *Inque vicem*, and the *labores bouum* are not in the *Orig.* but I hope the *labores hominum subeunt* are the precise Sense of it: and I am sure these Additions are so far from detracting from it, that they very much illustrate it. The *Inque vicem*, (which is much the same, but better, as *Johnston's Interea*) not only connects this with the former Verse, but has also something like it imply'd in the Words *goeth forth*, i. e. *ventures to go forth, now that these Beasts of Prey are at rest, and so he out of Danger*, as *Dr. Patrick* observes. Again the *labores bouum* seem yet to be more plainly intimated in the Text. *Santes Pagninus* (whose Version keeps as close to the *Orig.* as any) translates it, *Egreditur homo ad opus suum, ad culturam suam usque ad vespem*. This *cultura* I take to be the same with *agricultura*, or *Husbandry*; and can that be gone about without the Assistance and Labour of Oxen? Besides it is not improbable that *Buchanan* considered the Words of the *Orig.* as having (as is usual) much more in them than is express; and accordingly, as *Lions* and other savage Creatures are mentioned in the

two preceeding Verses, as not daring, by Divine Appointment, to come abroad till Night: So he supposes that, in this Verse, not only *Men*, but the *tame Animals*, among which the *Ox* is the most laborious, may be understood, as having a contrary Rule appointed them by God, namely, of coming and staying abroad in the Day-time, and resting in the Night. And this I take to be *Buchanan's* Meaning from the Words *Inque vicem*.

A Part of this Verse of his is, I own, borrow'd from *Virgil*. But, as it is here so fit and pat to his Purpose, that nothing could be more, if that is a Fault, I know no Poet since *Homer*, and perhaps not he, that can be safe.

And this will serve to answer what you say of the next Line, *Donec sera rubens*, &c. which you insinuate, as if *Buchanan*, like a School Boy, had found in *Virgil*, by looking into some *Dictionary poeticum* at the Word *Vesper*. I can hardly think that you can really and at the Heart have such an Opinion of *Buchanan*, or, if you have, you are infinitely mistaken about the Man, who can imagine that he had got all his Skill in Poetry at second Hand, and by the Help of such Books as these. You can tell us elsewhere, *Suppl. p. 10*. "That *Buchanan's* Language is from the Beginning to the End of the Book in every Page, all *Tully's* Prose," and it is much you did not add that he was beholden to some Common-place Book for it. But here, and more particularly, *Suppl. p. 35*. "You say, that his whole Translation from the Beginning to the End is made up of Lines, Scraps and Bits taken from *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Claudian*, *Statius*, *Martial*, and other Poets." Which I suppose you will not say that they borrowed from *Cicero*. You may reconcile these Things as you best can: You'll excuse me only here to observe, that as to the first of these Accusations, I know nothing in all *Buchanan's* Translation that comes nearer to Prose than *Johnston's*—*et in noctem continuatur opus*, in this very Place. For dissolve the Verse and read, *In noctem opus continuatur*; and it is very like to that of *Cicero*, pro *Flacco*, cap. 11. *Libertas ad hoc tempus continuata*; and more to that of *Cæsar*,



far, B. Civ. i. 62. *Opere diem & noctem continuato*. I would not be understood, as if I in the least did condemn *Johnston* in this (for I think there is no Fault in it) but I only use it as an *argumentum ad hominem*, to shew how unequal and grossly partial your Treatment of *Buchanan* is.

But what is most surprizing of all is, that you say of this Line, as well as of the former, "That he leaves the Royal Poet's Meaning for the sake of the Verse." The former I have accounted for already. As for this, are not the Words of the Orig. *Until the Evening*? And can that be more justly, as well as poetically, expressed than by *Donec sera rubens*, &c. till the *Evening Star* kindles its Light, or appears? Is it not very frequent with the best Authors to describe the *Evening* by the appearing of *Vesper*, or *Hesperus*, the *Evening Star*? I shall mention only one Place more in *Virgil*, *Geo. iii. 336*.

*Solis ad occasum, cum frigidus aëra Vesper  
Temperat.* ———

I cannot but smile at what you last subjoin here, where being sensible that it might be retorted upon you, that your Favourite was as much a Plagiary as *Buchanan*, by borrowing from the old Poets as well as he, you give the Matter a new but very strange Turn, by saying, not only what *Barclay* had said here of *Buchanan*, *Artificii est fundere versus Virgilii tanquam suos*, "That *Johnston* makes every thing he meddles with his own." But you add further, "In some Places in this Work he takes from *Ovid*, but then *Ovid* gains exceedingly by passing through his Hands: For Example in this very Psalm,

*Cedere jussit aquam, jussa recessit aqua:*  
"*Johnston* adds a great deal to the Beauty of this Line by joining it to the former with *marisque*: and the Manner in which *Ovid* applies it is very trifling: But in this Place it is introduced as properly as possible. In short every judicious Reader must imagine *Johnston* would have writ this Line if he had never seen *Ovid*: But no Body can think the same thing of *Buchanan*'s two Lines with Regard to *Virgil*." This is somewhat diverting: *Johnston*, you say, in some Places takes

takes from Ovid. You might have said very many Places: More I'm sure than from *Virgil* and *Horace*, or any other two or three of those ancient Poets put together: Which he would not have done, had he had that despicable Opinion you have of that Author. 'Tis a Pity, since, as you say, *Ovid* has gain'd so much by passing through *Johnston's* Hands, that he did not correct or improve that Author's Works, especially the *mutatæ ter quinque volumina formæ*, as he calls them, of his *Metamorphoses*, which were (as he himself tells us) *Orba parente suo*, — *Et quasi de domini funere raptæ sui*. How much Beauty is added to *Cedere jussit aquam*, &c. by putting *marisque* before it, 'is not easy to conceive. That the Manner in which *Ovid* applies it is trifling, I deny. The Subject he is upon, may be trifling: But the Manner in which he treats it, may be and really is excellent. It is not, as I have often said, the Subject, but the Manner of handling it that shews either the Orator or the Poet. But however so properly *Johnston* has introduced that Line of *Ovid*, I am one of these your *injudicious* Readers, that cannot easily be perswaded that he would have writ this very Line, if he had never seen *Ovid*. And, tho' I believe, that *Buchanan* had at least as great a *Genius*, and as large a Comprehension of the poetical Language, as *Johnston* or any Modern whatsoever, yet I have not such an Opinion of him, as that, if he had not seen *Virgil*, he would have hit upon these very Words, which he has here taken from him: Tho', at the same time, I will not stand to say, that they are as proper and pertinent to the Matter, as they are in *Virgil*, and that neither he nor *Johnston* could have contrived better. But why every judicious Reader must imagine what you say of *Johnston*, and that no Body (whether judicious or not) can think the same of *Buchanan*, is to me not a little mysterious.

What increases my Surprise not a little is that the ingenious Gentleman, whoever he is, that is the Author of the Letter subjoin'd to the 3d Part of Mr. *Lauder's Calumny display'd*, p. 75. seems to fall in exactly with your Sentiments, when in comparing the 7th and 8th Verses of this Psalm, as paraphras'd by our two Poets,

Sed

*Sed simul increpuit tua vox, &c. Buchanan. Sed simul intonuit tua vox, &c. Johnston.* He has these Words, "They are, both excellent; but *Buchanan's* Excellency consists in joining *Virgil's* Diction and sonorous Numbers to the elevated Sentiments of the Royal Prophet. He shines with Majesty, but 'tis a borrowed Majesty." *Johnston* has given to *David's* Thoughts his own natural easy Grandeur; *Cedere jussit aquam, jussu recessit aqua.*—This is odd: He says that *Buchanan* shines with Majesty, but with a borrowed Majesty; but *Johnston* with his own natural easy Grandeur; when yet (as he after acknowledges) that whole Line is borrowed from *Ovid*; and *Buchanan* has not taken so much as two Words together from *Virgil*, except *Cernere erat*, which yet considered by themselves, have very little of Grandeur in them, and are used by other Authors both in Verse and Prose. As for the other sonorous Words, such as *increpuit, tonitru, tremendo, and insonuere*; *Buchanan* chose them, not because they are in *Virgil*, (for they are all to be had in other Authors as well as in him) but because they were most proper for expressing the lofty Sentiments of the Original. Can any modern make use of Words in any kind of Composition, but such as the Language, he writes in, furnishes him with? And if the Majesty of those here in *Buchanan* is to be reckoned a borrowed Majesty; much more are those of *Johnston*, who besides that whole Line taken from *Ovid*, has the *intonuit* from *Virgil*; and the *surgere montes, fidere valles, Collibus incinctæ and nubiferisque jugis*, bear a greater Resemblance to *Ovid's lapidosos surgere montes, and subsidere valles*, Met. i. 43. 44. and his *incinctæ vestibus horæ*, Fast. v. 217. and *nubiferis Notis*, Her. iii. 58. than any thing here of *Buchanan* from *Virgil*. Not to mention that his *At simul intonuit tua vox* seems to be borrowed from *Buchanan's At simul increpuit tua vox*. But that *Johnston* would have said these very Words of *Ovid, Cedere jussit, &c.* without seeing him, as that Gentleman and you affirm, I must be excused not to believe.

But this is not the only thing wherein I humbly differ from the learned Author of that Letter, and particular-  
ly



ly in the Comparison he makes between the Stiles of our two Poets. The former of these, viz. of *Buchanan*, he will have to resemble that of *Q. Curtius*, which, says he, is a *florid and romantick* one: The latter, viz. *Johnston's*, he likens to that of *Xenophon* or *Julius Caesar*, which is *simple and elegant*. But, with Submission, I cannot help thinking that the Comparison is in every Respect wrong stated. For 1<sup>st</sup>, It is made *in alieno genere*, the Stile of a Poet and of an Historian being as different from one another, as can well be imagined. Had he compared them to two Orators, such as *Cicero* and *Seneca*, *Demosthenes* and *Isocrates*, &c. it had been somewhat more pertinent, there being a considerable Affinity between the one and the other. But to render the Comparison truly just and proper, it ought to have been stated betwixt the Stiles of our two Authors and those of two Poets, *Virgil* for instance and *Ovid*, *Propertius* and *Tibullus*, or the like. But 2<sup>dly</sup>, and which is much worse, if such a Comparison is capable of being made, it ought to be the Reverse of what he represents it. For *Buchanan's* Stile is so far from being *florid*, far less *romantick*, as he says that of *Q. Curtius* is, that of all our modern Poets I know none who have better preserv'd that masculine and elegant Simplicity, which we so much admire in the ancient Writers, and whose Stile is farther remov'd from all Gaudiness and Affectation than his. Whereas the Doctor, as I have at great length shew'd above, has swerv'd from that Rule in a great Number of Instances. We are further told by the Letter-writer, that *Buchanan's* Stile is *in the technical Part more sonorous* than that of *Johnston*. But that is no other than what was just and proper. For the Paraphrase of the former being generally done in *Lyrick* or *Heroick* Measures, the very Nature of the Verse required that the Numbers should be of a more elevated Sound and Strain than that of the other, which being done in *Elegiack* Metre, whose Numbers are naturally soft, smooth and easy, rendred high sounding Words and Expressions unfit for it. But of this I have spoke more fully elsewhere. See p. 59. and 80. I know not well what to make of that Gentleman's Saying, that

Bu-

*Buchanan labours more for it than Johnston.* If he means that *Buchanan* was at more Pains upon his Work than *Johnston*, I hope that is so far from being a Fault, that on the contrary it is highly commendable. *Horace*, I am sure, thought so, who allows no Poem to be of Value, *quod non Multa dies & multa litura coercuit*. But if his Meaning is, that *Johnston* had a more ready and easy Faculty of versifying than *Buchanan*, (tho' I know of no Ground for such a Supposition) yet even that is no Disparagement to *Buchanan*. Otherwise the great *Virgil* must be thought (contrary to the universal Perswasion) inferior to *Ovid*. For of the former it is said, that he did *carmen more ursæ parere, & lambendo demum effingere*; i. e. that his Composition cost him a great deal of Labour and Difficulty: Whereas the other tells us, that his Verses flowed from him with the greatest Ease imaginable. For thus he,

*Sponte suâ carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos :*

*Et quod tentabam dicere, versus erat.*

But of this too much :

(22.) It is now more than Time that we should proceed to Verse 24th,

*Sic, Pater, in cunctos didis te commodus usus.*

On which you refer us to what you had said in your *Supplem.* p. 40 and 41. where you usher in your Criticism on this Verse with telling us, that *Johnston* is always right, and *Buchanan*, upon the Matter, always wrong. "The one, you say, always expresses the Sense of the " *Orig.* fully, and (*which is wonderful*) concisely; the " other ever says too much, or too little." An Instance of the latter you give us in the 30th Verse of this Psalm, which shall be considered in its Place. And of the former in this Verse, *Sic pater, &c.* " where *Buchanan*, you " say, does not express half the Sense of the Original." But, say I, tho' somewhat concisely, he has given us the Import of the whole. The *Orig.* is, *O Lord, how manifold are thy Works! in Wisdom hast thou made them all: In the Vulgate, Quàm magnificata sunt operatua, Domine! omnia in sapientia fecisti: In Pagninus and Vatablus's Version, Quàm multiplicata sunt opera tua, Jehova!*  
omnia

*omnia ipsa in sapientia fecisti.* And all this is upon the Matter contain'd in these Words of *Buchanan*; which you yourself (had your invincible Prejudice permitted it) would have been sensible of, had you duly considered how comprehensive these two Words *commodus* and *didis* are. The former of these properly signifies (as the best *Lexicographers* explain it) when applied to a Person, *eum qui cum modo agit*, one who acts with due Measure, i. e. justly and wisely: And here, as it is applied to Almighty God, it denotes the consummate Wisdom and Exactness of the Divine Providence, in accommodating itself to the various Uses and Necessities of his Creatures. The other Word *didis* expresses the vast Extent of that Providence. *Didis te in cunctos usus*, i. e. *undique diffundis & dispartiris te, sive curam & quasi diligentiam tuam, in omnes animalium à te creatorum usus.* That this is the proper Signification of the Word *Didis*, will best appear from the Use of it in the most approved Authors. Thus *Horat. Sat. ii. 2. 6.* — *dum munia didit*, i. e. *dum servis singulis sua & sibi propria officia partitur.* *Virg. Æn. vii. 144.* — *diditur per agmina rumor*, i. e. *per omnem exercitum spargitur*: & *viii. 132.* — *tua terris didita fama*, i. e. *latè per multas terras fusa.* When all these are put together, and every Word receives its full Weight, the Import of *Buchanan's* Words will be, *Ad hunc modum, O magne rerum pater, tu qui omnia summa cum sapientia & accuratissimo judicio agis, tuam curam & providentiam ad tuarum creaturarum commodum utilitatemque undequaque diffundis.* And if so, pray, what is there wanting to express, O Lord, how manifold are thy Works! in Wisdom hast thou made them all. The Multiplicity of God's Works is partly signified by the Word *Sic*, which supposes what was said of a great Number of them before; and partly by the Words *in cunctos usus*, which likewise supposes these Uses to be very many: And the Wisdom in the Text, and the Diffusiveness of it are (as I said) contain'd in the Words *commodus* and *didis*. There is moreover something emphatical in the Word *Pater*, which denotes Origin of Being, Authority, Government, Affection and Care; all which Senses in an eminent Manner belong to Al-

mighty



*mighty God.* Accordingly *Buchanan* has with great Judgment so frequently given him that glorious and endearing Appellation in this Psalm, particularly in the Beginning and End of it.

To return a little to the Word *COMMODUS*, *Janus Rutgersius*, in his Note upon that of *Horace*, *Od. iii. 19.* 11. — *tribus aut novem Miscantor cyathis pocula commodis*, says, that the *Latins* used the Word *commodus* to signify whatever was *perfect in its kind*. But however the Word may be used elsewhere, I rather incline with *Mr. Dacier* to think that the *cyathi commodi*, in that Place, is to be taken for *Pots* or *Glasses* of a *reasonable* or *convenient Size*. And in the same Sense would I understand the Beginning of the 8th *Ode* of the 4th *Book* of that same Author, *Donarem pateras grataque commodus, Censorine, meis era sodalibus*, &c. (not, as most Commentators explain the Word *COMMODUS*, some *liberally*, others *cheerfully* or *frankly*, and others *magnificently* or *usefully*;) but that in making Presents to his Friends of the several things there mentioned, he would *ACCOMMODATE HIMSELF* to their various Tastes, Affections or Inclinations; according to which, to one he would give a Bowl, to another a Cauldron, to a third a Tripod, to a fourth a Statue, to a fifth a Picture, and so forth. *Commodus* is here much the same with *commode*, and, as *Dacier*, I would join it with *donarem*, and not, as *Torrensius* and *Sanadon*, with *sodalibus*. I beg Pardon further to observe, that the original Words, *cullam bebochmah gnasitba*, which our Translation renders, *In Wisdom hast thou made them all*, do not relate to the first Creation of them out of nothing, (as that may seem to import) but to the admirable Wisdom with which the several Parts of God's Works are so contrived and disposed as to be subservient to the Advantage, Preservation, and, where they are capable of it, Happiness, one of another, according to their various Ranks and Degrees. To confirm this, I am assured by one well skill'd in that Language, that the *Hebrew* Words above mentioned literally signify, *Omnia illa in sapientia disposuisti, In Wisdom hast thou fram'd, fitted*  
or

or order'd them all. To which Sense that Line of Dr. Johnston,

*O quàm solerti singula mente regis!*

comes pretty near. But, in my Opinion, the comprehensive and emphatick Words of *Buchanan*, as I have illustrated them,

*Sic, Pater, in cunctos didis te commodus usus,*  
do yet more fully and significantly express, not only that, but also the preceeding Part of the Verse, *O Lord, how manifold are thy Works!*

(23.) Proceed we to Verses 25th and 26th, as you rank them,

*Nec tantum tellus, Genitor, tua munera sentit  
Tam variis fecunda bonis: sed & æquora ponti  
Fluctibus immensis circumplectentia terras,  
Tam laxo spatiosa sinu: tot millia gentis  
Squamigeræ tremulæ per stagna liquentia caudâ  
Exsultant: tot monstra ingentia & horrida visu  
Veliferas circumnans puppes: grandia cete  
Effingunt molles vitreo sub marmore lusus.*

Of which you say, 1st, "That these two Verses again are so mixt together by *Buchanan*, that they cannot be parted." If *Buchanan* gives the full Meaning of the Text (which you cannot refuse) there is no need of parting the Verses. Nay, the more closely they are linked together, so much the more agreeable are they. See above p. 167. But in these Lines you have cited of his and of *Johnston's* are contain'd not only two Verses of the *Orig.* the 25th and 26th, but also a Part of the 24th, *The Earth is full of thy Riches.* And here I observe, tho' there is no Fault in it, yet it is far from being always true, what you say of *Johnston's* Paraphrase, that he makes his Distichs or Couplets answer the Verses of the *Orig.* and both to begin and end together. For here, in his Version,

*Divite tu gazâ terras & messibus imple,*  
belongs to the 24th Verse, and the following *Pentameter*,  
*Nec minus est vasti fertilis unda maris,*  
is but a Part of the 25th.

2. But to return to *Buchanan's* Lines, you next cry out of them, "What a Quantity of Chaff have we here

" 10

“to so little Corn? *aequora circumplectentia immensas*  
*“ terras* are said to be *spatiosa laxo sinu*, and *ingentia*  
*“ monstra* are likewise *horrida visu*, *stagna* are *liquentia*;  
*“ puppes* are *veliferas*, and Whales *vastly big*.” I may  
 here cry out in my Turn, What a Heap of empty Cavils  
 have we here against *Buchanan*, which cannot possibly  
 hold good without destroying the very Essence of Poetry?  
 If indeed we are to be reduced to your *Philosophical Lan-*  
*guage*, which admits of nothing but what is absolutely  
 necessary to make us understood, I own that there are se-  
 veral Words here which are not of such Necessity, and  
 which therefore would pass for *Chaff* in such a Language.  
 But is this the Language, or can it be the Language of  
 Poetry? So far from it, that it not only admits, but in-  
 dispensably requires a great Number of additional Orna-  
 ments, such as Epithets, Descriptions, Amplifications,  
 Periphrases, Repetitions of Words, &c. without which  
 no Poetry can subsist; and to call these *Chaff*, is to rob  
 it of its greatest and most essential Beauties. But to con-  
 sider more particularly these Things to which you give  
 that vilifying Name: When you quarrel that *aequora cir-*  
*cumplectentia immensas terras* are said to be *spatiosa laxo*  
*sinu*, you omit (whether of Design or otherwise, you  
 best know) the Word *Tam*, which here has a peculiar  
 Emphasis; as if he had said: *Not only is the Earth full of*  
*thy Riches, but the Sea also, which with its Waves sur-*  
*rounds that Earth, vast as it is; that Sea, I say, that is SO*  
*great and wide as to contain such an immense Body, as the*  
*Earth is, in its Bosom.* And this Paraphrase is very much  
 countenanced by the *Orig.* *So is this great and wide Sea;*  
 in the *Vulgate*, *Hoc mare magnum & spatiosum manibus:*  
*Vatablus, Hoc mare magnum & latum locis:* Where two  
 Things are likewise observable, 1<sup>st</sup>, That *Buchanan's*  
*laxo spatiosa sinu* comes closely up to the *Orig. uret habi-*  
*jadem*, which is literally *spatiosum manibus*: For what  
 are these *manus* or *Hands* of the Sea, but its various  
 Bays and Creeks which like so many *Arms\** (as we al-  
 so in *Scotland* call them) grasp and infold the Earth in  
 its

\* Thus *Ovid*, *Met. i.* *Nec brachia longo Margine terrarum porrectas*  
*Amphirite:*



its Bosom: Not to mention that the *Latin* Word *sinus* signifies both. 2dly, That in both our *English* Translations the Words *So is*, which are not in the *Original* are added to connect this Verse with the former, the same Way as *Buchanan's Nec tantum,—sed* before, and especially the *TAM* here, which little Word, you see, has blown away all that imaginary *Chaff* which you fancied to be in these his Words.

That you should reckon the Addition of *horrida visu* to *monstra ingentia*, *Chaff* or impertinent, is yet more surprizing. For does not their being *monstra*, and *ingentia*, make them *horrida visu*? Does not *Virgil* say, *Æn.* iii. 26.

*Horrendum et distu video mirabile monstrum.*

And *Æn.* vii. 78.

*Id vero horrendum & visu mirabile ferri.*

And *Æn.* xi. 271.

*Nunc etiam horribili visu portenta sequuntur?*

There is not in these, nor in *Buchanan*, so much as one Word that may not have place, even in your *Philosophical* Language.

As to the *stagna liquentia*, has not the same *Virgil*, not to mention others, *Geo.* iv. 442. *fluvium liquentem*, and *Æn.* ix. 697. *liquentia flumina*; as also, *Geo.* ii. 200. *liquidi fontes*, and *Æn.* vii. 760. *liquidi lacus*? And are not all these as *liquid* as the Water of the Sea? Or if you take the Word for *clear*, is not the Sea generally as clear as Rivers or Lakes? But what think you of *humida stagna*, in the same Author, *Æn.* xii. 476. where the Epithet is essential to the Subject?

Then, As to *veliferas puppes*, have not *Propertius* iii. 7. and *Ovid*, *Met.* xv. 719. and *ex Pont.* iii. 2. 67. *velifera carina*? And who knows not that *puppis*, *carina*, *prora* are most frequently by the Poets used synecdochically for the whole Ship? *Ovid* also, *ex Pont.* iv. 5. 4. has *velivolæ rates* much the same Way.

Finally, As to the *grandia cete*, are not *Whales* vastly big? And is it yet a Fault to call them so? Does not the inspired Writer call them *great Whales* at the very Creation of them, *Gen.* i. 21? And has not *Virgil*, *Æn.* v. 822. *Im-*  
*mania*

*mania cete*, and *Geo. iv. 394. immania Neptuni armenta*? Could *Buchanan* follow better Examples? I pass *Ovid's balenarum immania terga*, because you despise that Poet's Authority; how justly we shall see afterwards.

Here you run out into a long Digression upon your *Alliterations* and *Rhimes*: Of which I have said enough already. Among other Things you vastly commend *Johnston's maris incola pistrinx*, and tell us, "That if he had said *maris incola cetus*, the Word *cetus* would have destroy'd all the Musick of the Verse." Had it been ordinary with the Poets to use *cetus* in the singular Number, I as think it is not; I see nothing that hinders; but that the Sound of it here might be agreeable enough. And I must add, that if the Want of such Jinglys and Chimings of Letters and Syllables will destroy, where it happens, all the Musick of a Verse, then there are many thousand Verses in *Virgil*, *Horace*, nay *Johnston* himself, that are very unharmonious. But to pass this, may I not here ask what need was there for calling this *Pistrinx*; *maris incola*, more than for *Buchanan's* calling *cete grandia*, the one Property being as natural as the other? And again, Is it allowable in *Johnston* to repeat the Word *maris* here, which we had but three Lines before; and yet not allowable in *Buchanan* to do the same with *virides* and *succus*, within the like Space?

(24.) I go on to Verse 27,

*Atque adeo quæ terra arvis; quæ fluctibus æquor*

*Educat, à te uno pendent, pater optime, teque*

*Quæque suo proprium poscunt in tempore victum.*

where, though you reckon, "These to be the three best Lines of *Buchanan*, which we have met with in this Psalm;" Yet that they may not altogether escape your Criticisms, you add, "That *arvis* and *fluctibus* are both superfluous, strictly speaking; neither can the Verses on any Account be supposed to equal *Johnston's*." I have some Guess of what you mean by the Words *strictly speaking*, namely, that *philosophically speaking* they might be wanted, or the Sense be understood without them. But, as I have often said, the *philosophical* and *poetical* Language vastly differ, and what

is superfluous in the one, is very often necessary in the other. The former is like a Tree in the Winter-time, barely and abstractly considered as a Tree or Piece of Wood in the Earth; the other is like the same Tree in Summer, described with its wide spreading Branches, Leaves, Blossoms or Fruit. And particularly what you blame here as superfluous, is a most beautiful Contrast, where the *arva* of the Earth, and the *fluctus* of the Sea are set the one over against the other. And on this very account, though you will not allow it to be so much as supposable, that *Buchanan's quæ terra arvis, quæ fluctibus aquor Educatur*, is equal to *Johnston's Quicquid humus vel pontus alit*, I on the contrary think the former much superior to the latter.

(25.) On Verse 28,

*Te magnam pendente manum, saturantur abunde*

*Omnia: te rursus vultum condente, fatiscunt:*

you remark, "That *magnam, abunde* and *rursus*, are "all Expletives." I on the contrary think them great Beauties, and that the Want of them would be no small Defect. What more expressive of the *boundless Extent* of the Divine Providence, which is here called *God's Hand*, than to call it *magna*, big, huge or large? And what more proper to signify the inexhaustible Store of good Things with which that *Hand* is fill'd, than to say that all Creatures are in *great Abundance* supplied from it? And is it a mere Expletive, when the Psalmist had in one Verse represented *God's Liberality* to his Creatures, and in another the with-drawing of it, which is call'd *Hiding his Face*, to usher in this his different Conduct, with a *rursus*, *Again, on the other Hand*? 'Tis hard with *Buchanan*, when his Excellencies are condemn'd as Faults.

(26.) But we shall see him worse treated in Verses 29. and 30.

*Te tollente animam, subito exanimata recurrunt*

*In cinerem: inspirante animam te denuò, surgit*

*Illico fecundæ sobolis generosa propago,*

*Et desolatas gens incolit aurea terras.*

For you tell us, "*Te tollente animam exanimata sunt,*  
&c.



" &c. *When you take away their Lives, they are without*  
 " *Life, &c.* But by and by when you *breath Life again*  
 " *into them, surgit generosa propago fecundæ sobolis, the*  
 " *generous Offspring of the fruitful Stock ariseth, or sup-*  
 " *pose it was the fruitful Stock of the generous Offspring,*  
 " *would not that do as well?" And then you cry out.*  
 " *What a Task have I undertaken to compare such*  
 " *empty Stuff as this, with some of the finest Lines*  
 " *that ever Man writ?" And may not I with better*  
 " *Ground cry out, What a Task have I undertaken to*  
 " *rake into such empty Stuff, and to rub off that Heap of*  
 " *Dirt, which you have so unworthily thrown on the Face*  
 " *of the greatest Poet, not of his own Age only, but many*  
 " *before and since? But, as you have no where shew'd*  
 " *more ill Nature against him, so have you no where*  
 " *more grossly misrepresented, shall I call it, or misunder-*  
 " *stood him, than here For he does not say, as you word*  
 " *it, Te tollente animam exanimata sunt: But te tollente a-*  
 " *nimam, exanimata subito recurrunt in cinerem: Which is*  
 " *not, When you take away their Lives, they are without*  
 " *Life, as you would have him fillily to have said: But,*  
 " *When thou takest away their Breath or Spirit, as it is in*  
 " *the Orig. or, if you will, Life, they, being thus deprived of*  
 " *Breath, Spirit or Life, fall suddenly back again into Dust.*  
 " *So that the exanimata after anima, is so far from being a*  
 " *Blemish, that it is, when rightly understood, a great Beauty.*

You are no less out in what you say of *propago fecun-*  
*dæ sobolis*, for tho' *soboles* and *propago* are often used pro-  
 miscuously; yet *soboles* (as the Word originally im-  
 ports) signifies a young Plant or Sprig shooting forth  
 from the Root of a Tree, and metaphorically a Child,  
 or the Breed and Offspring of any Animal; and *pro-*  
*pagō* the Growing up or shooting forth of such a Sprig,  
 or new born Child, or other young Creature, whence the  
 Verb *propagare*, as *propagare stirpem, propagare genus,*  
*propagare fines imperii*: So that *generosa propago fecundæ*  
*sobolis* is not the generous Offspring of the fruitful Stock,  
 (tho' there is no Harm, if we should so understand it)  
 or the fruitful Stock of the generous Offspring, (which is  
 hardly Sense here) but a noble or flourishing Production,

or Increase of or from a fruitful Stock: Or, if you will, a generous Production or Propagation of a numerous Offspring.

But, as I am as heartily wearied of setting Things right, as you seem to be of putting them wrong, I am glad to say with you, "That we happily begin *terris advertere proram.*" Only you'll forgive me, by the by, to take Notice, that, notwithstanding the lofty Encomium you give to *Johnston's* Lines here, his *te revocante animam* seems improper: For that, one would think, should rather signify to call back a Soul from Death to Life, than the contrary, to recall it from Life to Death. I am sure *Revocate animos* in *Virgil* is not to lose Courage, but to renew or recover it. And the same Author has *revocatum à morte*, but I doubt if he would have said *revocatum à vita*.

(27.) Come we then to Verse 31 and 32.

*Sic eat, O nullo regnet cum fine per ævum  
Majestas divina: suumque in secula letus  
Servet opus Deus: ille Deus, quo territa tellus  
Concitantem tremit, montes tangente vaporant,  
Fumiferâ trepidum nebula testante pavorem.*

First you say, "What Use is there of *per ævum*, at the "End of the first Line, but to supply a Foot and the "third of a Foot." You seem to be very nice in your Calculation. I have many Times heard of a *Semipes* or half a Foot, but never till now of a third of a Foot. But you'll allow me to tell you, that for all this your Exactness, you are wrong in your Division or Parts of a Foot: For this *per*, which you call the third of a Foot, is really but the 4th of one, the short Syllable of a *Dactyle* being no more. You reckon the Parts of a Foot by the Number of Syllables that are in it. Thus the *Dactyle sine per*, has three Syllables, and consequently, according to you, three Parts, of which *per* is the last. But I am surprized that you, who are so much taken up about Letters and Syllables, should not know better Things. For there is none that have writ to any Purpose on the Subject, but might have taught you that every long Syllable consists of two Times, and every short Syllable of one

one *Time* only; and that accordingly in every *Daytle* there are two *Semipedes*, and that the first Syllable, which is always a long one in it, constitutes the first *Semipes*, and the two short ones that follow, make the second. If then, in the *fine per*, the Syllable *fi* makes the first *Semipes* or half Foot, then the *ne* and *per* must make the other; and of Consequence, if you will subdivide this second *Semipes* in two Parts, the whole Foot must consist of four Parts, of which the *fi* makes two, and the *ne* and *per* other two: Or in other Words, if the *fi* is one half, and the *ne* and *per* together the other half, then the *ne* and the *per* separately, must make each a fourth Part. But to leave these Trifles, and to shew that it was not to supply a 3d or 4th of a Foot, that *Buchanan's per ævum* is added after *nullo cum fine*; but that he acted the true Poet in so doing, I shall prove, 1<sup>st</sup>, That the Addition is not superfluous. And 2<sup>dly</sup>, That tho' in your strict philosophical Language it may seem to be so, yet both in Oratory and Poetry it is oftentimes a great Beauty.

1<sup>st</sup>, That it is not superfluous, will appear from the original Signification of the Word *ævum*, which is the same with the Greek *αἰών*, from which it is also derived, *An Age*, otherwise in Latin *seculum* or *ætas*, which last again from *ævum*, at first *ævitas*. See *Cicero de legib. iii.* 3. It came afterwards to be used for a long Space of time, and at last for *Perpetuity* or *Eternity*. But that in the best Authors it still retains its primary Signification, we have innumerable Examples, such as *breve ævum*, *omnibus ævis*, *primo ævo*, &c. And even when a perpetual Duration is intended to be signified, they added an Adjective of that Import to it, as *sempiternum ævum* in *Cicero*, *immortale ævum* in *Lucretius*, *æternum ævum* in *Ovid*. And to shew you how little your philosophical Language was regarded by them, what is *sempiternus* but the coupling of *semper* and *æternus*: Nay *æternus* itself is but a Corruption of *æviternus*. If therefore you should rigorously criticize upon *Ovid's æternum ævum*, you would say it was an *æterna æternitas*, and of *Cicero's sempiternum ævum*, that it was the same with a *semper durans æter-*



*æterna æternitas*; and can *Buchanan's ævum sine fine* or *cum nullo fine* be worse than these? You see whither your Cavils will drive us, and that if we will give Way to them, no Author can stand before you.

But 2<sup>dly</sup>, Tho' these Words *nullo cum fine* and *per ævum* did really signify the same Thing, yet I say that that is so far from being a Fault, that oftentimes, as here, it is a great Beauty: There being nothing more frequent, especially in Poetry, than to illustrate or give a greater Force to a Word, by adding another of the same or like Signification. And this particularly takes place, when the Matter is of great Importance; and what can be more so than *perpetual Duration*? What is more ordinary in holy Writ, than *for ever and ever*, and *ever World without End*: Or *in seculum & in seculum*, and *in secula seculorum*? But if that is not to be a Rule to a Poet, take these Examples of some of the best of them, *Lucret. i. 950.*

*Sed quoniam docui solidissima materiai*

*Corpora perpetuò volitare invicta per ævum.*

And *Hor. Od. iv. 14. 2. tuas—virtutes in ævum—Æternet—*And *Virg. Æn. i.*

*His ego nec metas rerum, nec tempora ponam*

*Imperium sine fine dedi.*—And again, *Æn. vi.*

—*æternumque tenet per secula nomen.*

Was *Virgil* forced here to add *per secula* to *æternum*, to supply his Verse, as *Buchanan* you say was to add *per ævum* to *cum nullo fine*, to supply his? I subjoin that of *Ovid*, whose Authority, whatever you may think of him, will be of some Value with other People, *Met. xiv. 132.*

*Lux æterna mihi carituraque sine dabitur.*

But I have yet another Authority, which you cannot possibly get over, viz. that of your beloved *Johnston*, *Pf. lxviii. 35.*

*Illius excluso sine perennet honos:*

and *Pf. cxxxviii. 8.*

*Namque tuus dempto sine perennat amor.*

where, I hope *perenno* implies as long Duration as *per ævum*: *Perennis*, I'm sure and *perennitas*, are the same as *perpetuus* and *perpetuitas*.

2. You

2. You add, "As to the Translation of the rest of this Passage, I have shewn elsewhere that it is nothing but *Smoke* without either *Light* or *Heat*." The Place you refer to is *Suppl. p. 41.* where you shew nothing, but after your usual Method cry out, "What a Heap of Words have got together here, and to how little Purpose?" By this Phrase, *A Heap of Words have got together*, you would seem to insinuate, as if these Words were none of *Buchanan's*, but that they accidentally met together, as *Epicurus's* Atoms did to make up his World. What you say of his giving us *Smoke* only without *Light* or *Heat*, is not so much a Banter upon him as the sacred Text, where it is said of God, That *he toucheth the Hills, and they smoke*. Here *Smoke* is mentioned, without any thing's being said, or perhaps intended, either of *Light* or *Heat*. If this Passage refers to God's Appearance on Mount *Sinai* (as some think) at the Giving of the Law; we are told that it was covered with *Clouds of Smoke* and *thick DARKNESS*, *Deut. iv. 11. and v. 22.* But to shew, not by a bare Assertion, or Exclamation, as your Manner is, but in reality that there can be nothing more unjust and groundless, than what you here throw out against our Author, I shall set down both the Original, and his Version. The former has it; *He looketh on the Earth and it trembleth: He toucheth the Hills, and they smoke*. The latter — *Ille Deus, quo territa tellus*

*Concutiente tremit, montes tangente vaporant,  
Fumifera trepidum nebulâ testante pavorem.*

Now I appeal to all Persons of Taste and Ingenuity, if ever, since the Days of *Ovid*, they saw finer Verses, or more expressive of the Sense of the Text. He begins with an elegant *Anaphora*, or Repetition of the Word *Deus*, with the emphatical Pronoun *ille* pointing him forth; *Servet opus Deus, ille Deus, &c.* As to the Words, — *quo territa tellus Concutiente tremit*, he at first, as I am told, had it *Adspiciente tremit*, which is indeed more close and literal; but he, who was a better Judge than either you or I, afterwards changed it into *Concutiente tremit*, as being (I suppose) of greater Force, and, upon the Matter, expressing the same thing that is said of the

awful

awful Effects of the Divine Power in the Holy Scriptures, as express'd by *shaking the Heavens, Earth, &c.* as *Hag. ii. 6. I will shake the Heavens and the Earth, and the Sea and the dry Land. Isa. ii. 19. When he ariseth to shake terribly the Earth.* See also *Pf. xviii. 7. and xxix. 8. and Heb. xii. 26, &c.* And if it be said that *concutiente* and *tremis*, express the same thing, I deny it: For every thing that is *shaken* or *moved*, does not therefore *tremble*. *Simeon de Muis*, in his excellent Commentary, thought otherwise. His Words are, *Sensus: Præpotens, inquam, ille Deus, qui vel solo aspectu terre orbem, quando vult, sic totum concutit, ut tremat: qui solo tactu ita montes accendit, ut fumum & flammæ vomant.* As to *Buchanan's* Omission of *aspectu*, or the instrumental Cause of God's making the Earth to tremble, there is nothing in it; for that is the same with the awful Presence or Power of God, as it is express'd *Judg. v. 4, 5. and Pf. lxxviii. 7, 8.* where the same thing is spoke of, and is imply'd in the Word *concutiente*. I hope at least that the *Alliteration* of the Letter *T* in *tellus territa tremis*, will please you: \* Nor will you alledge that the *territa*, tho' not in the *Orig.* is an idle Expletive to *tremis*, since the one naturally goes before, and is the Cause of the other. As to the

*Fumiferâ trepidum nebulâ testante pavorem,*  
tho' indeed it speaks something of *Smoke*, yet as 'tis a noble Illustration of what went before, it needs not, I think, give you much Offence. If it does, you may leap over it, the Sense being complete on each Side without it. But at the same time you will allow me to like it, and to tell you that I would not quit it for any Line in either Poet. If you fancy that *trepidum* is an idle Epithet to *pavorem*, (as I am persuaded it is not) yet you'll forgive it, for the Sake (not of *Ovid's pavidò metu, Amor. i. 7. 20. and Fit timor, & pavidâ trepidat formidine pectus,*

\* *Johnston's* Words, I am sure, *Pf. xcix. i. — athereo sub pede, terra, tremit,* with which you are ravished. *Pref. Disc. p. 48.* have a greater Resemblance to these of *Buchanan* than to *Virgil's Stetit illa tremens Æn. ii. 52.* to which you there compare them.



*Æt.* Met. ii. 66. for his Authority is naught with you, but that) of the great *Virgil's trepidus formidine*, *Æn.* vi. 290. and *trepidâ formidine*, *Æn.* ix. 756. Thus I will not say that I have dispell'd the *Smoke* that offended you in *Buchanan*, for that could not be done; since the Text, as well as *Johnston's fumant*, bear it; but I have at least rendred it harmless and innocent. As to the *Light* and *Heat*, which you say are wanting, I have shew'd that there is as much of both in it, as was requisite. If *Clearness* and *Perspicuity* is *Light*, and *Poetick Life* and *Spirit* is *Heat*, we have as much of the one and the other, as is readily to be met with any where.

(28.) I go forward to Verse 33 and 34.

*Hunc ego dum vivam, dum spiritus hos regit artus,  
Usque colam: tantum ille meas facilisque bonusque  
Accipiat voces: nempe illo oblector in uno.*

where you at last acknowledge that *Buchanan* has shewn some Art. For after an Exclamation, *Si sic omnia dixisset!* you add, "These Lines in *Buchanan* are very fine and perfect in all Respects." And yet they are not quite right for all that. For "he has not, say you, so fully express'd the Sense of the Orig. in the first Verse, *I will sing unto the Lord, I will praise my God*, as *Johnston* has done; *Buchanan* having nothing for it, but two Words, *usque colam*, *Johnston* a whole Line, and a very strong one,

*"Hic mihi materies carminis unus erit."*

In the *Orig.* it is plain that the same Thought is doubled, which, tho' a Beauty in these oriental Languages, is not always so in *Latin* or *Greek*. Besides *Johnston's* Line has no Repetition of the Thought in it, more as *Buchanan*: He has only *Hic* for *the Lord*, and *my God*: And *mibi materies carminis unus erit*, for *I will sing, I will praise*. And I see nothing hinders but that *Buchanan's Hunc usque colam*, since it expresses the full Sense (for tho' doubled in the *Orig.* it is but one) does answer the Purpose as well as *Johnston's* whole Line.\* *Conciseness,*  
i. e.

\* Nay, if we will more strictly consider the Words, we will find upon the Matter, that they are to be explained as doubled in both Poets:

i. e. *few Words*, is by you reckoned, on other Occasions, among that Author's greatest Perfections.

(29.) We are now, at length, arrived at the last Verse of this Psalm.

*At verò impietas planè exstirpetur ab ima*

*Radice, & scelerum stirps nulla repullulet : ac nos*

*Te rerum, Deus alme, patrem Dominumque canemus.*

where, agreeably to yourself, you tell us, " That you cannot but observe, that *Buchanan* in this Conclusion has followed *Horace's* Rule,

" — *Servetur ad imum*

" *Qualis ab incepto processerit, & sibi constet.*"

*id est*, as you misapply and invert *Horace's* Rule, from Beginning to End all is bad. For immediately you add, " As he began this Piece with trifling Expletives, and " has hitherto carried it on in the same Manner, so here " we see *verò*, *plane* and *ac nos*, all properly (i. e. *idly*) " ranged."

As to these Expletives, which you here quarrel, in *Buchanan*, I am sorry to say, that your monstrous Prejudice against him has so far transported you, that you seem to have forgotten the very *Genius* of the *Latin* Tongue. *Verò* the first of these is indeed, what it is commonly called, an *expletive Conjunction*, i. e. not (in your new philosophical Dialect) necessary to the Sense : But then, when properly used as here, it is absolutely necessary to the Beauty of the Language. It is generally brought in in the Beginning of a Sentence, and more especially, as in this Place, when something *opposite* to, or much *different* from what went before, is to be express'd, and is much of the same Nature with *autem* and *quidem*, and the *Greek* *δέ* and *γέ*. The Use of it, as of them, is to connect a following with a preceeding Sentence : Than which as nothing can be more proper in a continued Discourse, so there is hardly any thing,

in

---

Poets: The *Hunc usque colam*, tho' but once express'd, being to be applied first to *ego dum vivam*, and again to *dum spiritus hos regit artus*. And in like Manner, the *Hic mihi materies*, &c. in *Johnson*, is to be construed both with *Aethere dum vesci datur*, and with *dum vitalibus auris vesci datur*.

in the right Application whereof a great many Writers are more deficient. Thus in the Passage before us, the *Psalmist*, after enumerating a great many Instances of God's universal Providence, and the Care he takes of his Creatures, and the great Pleasure it gave to the *Psalmist* himself to meditate upon it, immediately turns his Discourse another Way, by intimating, that wicked Men, whatever Share they may have for a Time of this Beneficence of God, yet because of their Ingratitude and Undutifulness to him, they shall at last utterly perish. And could this Conduct of the Divine Providence, so different from what is said of it before, be better usher'd in than with an *At vero*, *But truly*, *But however*, *But this Goodness of God notwithstanding*, &c. Is not this, not to mention others, most frequently *Virgil's Way*? I have observ'd him to begin a Sentence with *At vero* five or six times, and at other times with *Tum vero*, *Hoc vero*, *Ne vero*, *Id vero*, and the like: And the Word before *vero* is always, I think, in him a Monosyllable, and generally there is an Elision of the last Syllable of *vero*, as here. He that will in good earnest condemn *Buchanan* for this, (as I hope you do not) I must pronounce him a great Stranger to the right Use of the *Latin Particles*.

As to the Word *planè*, your second *Expletive*, I confess it is not absolutely necessary to the Sense: But that does not hinder its having its own Significancy, which is much the same with *prorsus*, *omnino*, and imports the *Fulness* and *Completeness* of a Thing's being, or to be, what is said of it, as in this Place, where the *absolute* and *utter* Destruction of impious Men is wish'd or foretold. I add *foretold*, because it is agreed by most Interpreters, that tho' the *Orig.* Words contain an *Imprecation*, yet they are to be understood rather as a *Prediction* than a *Curse*.

And finally, as to the *Ac* before *nos*, in some Copies it is read, *At nos*: Which I would like better, but that I am afraid, you would quarrel its being too near the *At* in the foregoing Line. But whether *Ac* or *At*, it is necessary to make an agreeable Transition from that to  
this



this new Sentence; for which Purpose your *Johnston* uses *Interea*. It is moreover observable that, whereas in the 1st Verse of this Psalm *Buchanan* speaks only of himself in the singular Number, *Te rerum, Deus alme, canam, &c.* here, that he might take in the concluding *Hallelujah, Praise ye the Lord*, he goes to the Plural, *Nos canemus*. By which Means he has out done *Johnston* in *Conciseness*, for he has taken four Lines to this Verse, but *Buchanan* only three: Not to mention that *Johnston's* whole last Line stands for the one original Word *TE*.

And thus I have at last got through the troublesome and ungrateful Task you have set me, in the Comparison you have made betwixt these two Poets in their Paraphrases of three of the Psalms, viz. as you have order'd them, the cxxxvii. the i. and the civ. and I hope, if I am not too much conceited of my Labour, I have not only vindicated *Buchanan's* Honour from all the Exceptions, unjust Censures and groundless Cavils, you have brought to overthrow it; but also have prov'd him, in these, and through that whole noble Work, to be *IN EVERY RESPECT* (the very Reverse of what you maintain *Suppl. p. 2.*) *GREATLY SUPERIOR TO DR. Johnston, Q. E. D.*

I could have added a great Deal to the general Remarks I have, towards the Beginning of this Treatise, made upon the Doctor's Performance, and (tho' in the main it is truly excellent in its Kind) yet I could in my Turn have criticiz'd upon several Things, besides these already hinted at, in these three Psalms, which to me seem liable to Exception. But I chose rather to forbear, lest by following too much your Example, I should contract the same wrong Bias and unjustifiable Prejudices, that you all along have suffered yourself to be carried away with.

### *Buchanan and Johnston's Dedications compared.*

There remains yet one small Part of my Task, to which (tho' in Order the first) you have given the

last Place, I mean the two *Epigrams* or *Dedications* of the two Paraphrases. And, that your Favourite might not in all things have the Preference, you give out, *Conclus. p. 4.* that "As to the boasted Epigram address'd to the *Caledonian Nymph*, you have another Nymph of the same Country to be produced on *Johnston's* Side, which will absolutely eclipse all the Charms of the former." *i. e.* in plain Language, that *Johnston's* Dedication is vastly superior to that of *Buchanan*.

And here I was once in a Doubt, whether I should take any Notice of the Comparison you make between these two Epigrams: The Absurdities you therein advance, being so gross, and if possible so far above any of the former, that they are obvious to every Body that knows any thing of *Latin* Poetry. However, because in this your last Attack, you insult *Buchanan* with such a contemptuous Air, and that I might leave nothing, that you can say against him, unanswered and unconfuted, I shall as briefly as the thing will admit, go through the several Objections you make to this short, but which, in Defiance to ill Nature itself, I shall still esteem an incomparable Epigram.

You introduce what you have to say against it, with a flaunting Bravado, "Thus I have, *say you, Conclus. p. 39.* gone through these two boasted Psalms [*viz. the i. and civ. you having, in your fond Conceit, beat the cxxxvii. out of the Field before, in your Suppl. p. 31. & seqq.*] and now we are come to the Ladies: I begin with her Majesty, *Ad MARIAM illustrissimam Scotorum Reginam.*" But to pass this Piece of false and not very mannerly Wit, I go on to the *Epigram* itself. And,

To begin with the first Couplet,

*Nympha Caledoniae quae nunc feliciter ora*

*Missæ per innumeros sceptræ tueris avos.*

you own that "The Sense is clear, and the Versification excellent, and add that the hexameter Line in particular is delicately alliterated with the Vowel *e* five times in a full Sound." This is much from you. But it shall not come of without a *But*, for immediately you sub-

subjoin: " But as to the Language, *nunc* is introduced perfectly for the Sake of the Metre: *tueris* is certainly of the present Tense, and *nunc* can never be admitted; but when it refers to *olim* or some such Word in a former Place." After this you may say any thing, and make

*Candida de nigris & de candentibus atra.*

You tell us that *tueris* is certainly of the present Tense. Who doubts it? or what could be more properly join'd with it than *nunc*, which is as certainly a Particle that denotes the present? But you add that *nunc* can never be admitted, but when it refers to *olim*; or some such Word in a former Place. But does that, or would that alter the time of *nunc* itself, or render it improper to be join'd with *tueris*? What? would you have him to have said *que nunc tuebaris*? 'Tis true the Word *nunc* has generally a Respect to some past Time. But must that past Time be not only always express'd, but go before too? Or, is it not sufficient that it be implied in the rest of the Sentence, or by what went before or comes after it? And can it be more clearly and distinctly implied, I may say express'd, than in the Words *missa per innumeros avos*? Did not the far greater Part of these *innumeri avi* (tho' your Doctors *Lloyd* and *Stilling fleet*, and our Mr. *Innes* have endeavoured to rob us of the first 40 of them) live and reign *olim*, a long time ago, Kings of Scotland: Or, to come closer to the Point, can you say that it is improper in common English to say, *O great Lady, who NOW happily sways the Scepter of Scotland, which has been handed down to you through a numberless Race of Ancestors*? or *who NOW after a numberless Race of Ancestors*, &c. Nay I will go further (and could produce innumerable Examples for it) in telling you, that the Word *nunc* may be properly enough used, when there is no other Word signifying, or so much as directly implying, (as here *Missa*, &c.) a past Time going before it. I know not if these of *Virgil*, *Ecl. 9. 66.*

*Define plura puer, & quod nunc instat agamus.*  
or *Geo. ii. 227.*

*Nunc, quo quamque modo possis cognoscere, dicam.*

or

\* This  
Battle of  
the Han  
priety in  
rum Tem  
of the pa  
the erat  
Meaning  
pened, w  
we, who  
pray'd fe  
† Your  
not super  
orbis: Nun  
a Verb eit



or *Æn.* viii. 441.

*Arma acri facienda viro: nunc viribus usus,  
Nunc manibus rapidis, omni nunc arte magistrâ.*

and a great many such like will satisfy you. But you cannot possibly get over that of *Horace*, where it begins the *Ode. lib. i.* 37.

*Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero  
Pulsanda tellus.*——\*

'Tis true *antebac* follows after in the next Stanza: But following after and going before are very different things. And what think you of that of *St. James*, in the very Beginning of *Chap. v.* *Go to now, Agite nunc*, &c. where, as it has no Connection with what went before, in the preceeding Chapter, so is there not the least Insinuation of any past time, following in *this*? But why should I dwell upon a thing that is as clear as the Sun at Noon-day: Nay so clear, that were the *missa per innumeros a-vos* away, it would still be good and proper Language, to say, *O Nympha, quæ nunc tueris sceptrâ Scotiæ, Accipe?*——†

The next Couplet is,

*Quæ sortem antevenis meritis, virtutibus annos,  
Sexum animis, morum nobilitate genus.*

Here likewise you own, that were it not for one thing, these two Lines could not be found Fault with.\* It is but a low Commendation, that two of the finest Lines that ever Poet writ, are only such as are not to be found Fault

Z

Fault

\* This *Ode* was writ on the Defeat of *Mark Antony* at the fatal Battle of *Actium*, which put the Sovereignty of the Roman Empire into the Hands of *Augustus Caesar*: And there may seem to be an Impropriety in the following Words,——*nunc Salaribus ornare pulvinar* [*Deorum Tempus erat dapibus, sodales*, in that *nunc* is join'd with *erat* a Verb of the past Tense. But there is no Impropriety in the Expression: For the *erat* is rather to be join'd with *tempus* than with *nunc*: For the Meaning, as I take it, is, that this now, or that which has now happened, was the Time, which we, *domiti qui favimus isti*, as *Ovid* words it, we, who were in the Interest of the *Julian Family*, long wished and pray'd for, and which has now happily come to pass.

† Your Favourites the Particle *Nunc* much more improperly, if not superfluously, in *Pf. xcviij. 9.* *Stat Deus ante fores, cives ut censeat orbis: Nunc quæ promeruit præmia quisque feret*: Where it is join'd with a Verb either of the past or future Tense.

*Fault with.* But tho' this is much from you, yet even that must be qualified; for they have notwithstanding one great Fault, viz. "That the *pentameter* Verse is too gross a Plagiarism, even for a School-boy. It is almost entirely *Ovid's*,

" *Exsuperas morum nobilitate genus, Tr. iv. 4. 1.*"

I shall not resume what I have said above, p. 210, in Justification of a Poet's borrowing Sentiments, Phrases, and sometimes whole Lines from others that went before him, provided they are proper and pertinent to the Subject he is upon; as what you blame here is in the strictest manner. What I principally take notice of, is the unaccountable Partiality, which you discover, as in many other Places, so egregiously in this. For if such borrowing of Verses, or Parts of Verses, from ancient Authors be a *Plagiarism*, or Fault too gross even in a School-boy, what will become of your darling Author, who is as guilty that way, if not more, than *Buchanan*? I have something of a Design of giving you a very large List of such *Borrowings*, or *Plagiarisms*, as you call them, in your *Johnston*, afterwards. But in the mean time, take you the few following Examples, which will shew that he was not more religious in that Respect than *Buchanan*; and, which is worse, they are all taken from this same *Ovid*, a Poet whom, of all the ancients, you seem most to despise.

Pf. x. i. — *rerum tutela mearum.*

Ovid Trist. v. 14, 15. — *rerum sola es tutela mearum.*

xi. 3. — *quo tueatur habet.*

Fast. i. 86. — *quod tueatur habet.*

xvi. 3. *Altiùs humanis si quis caput extulit* —

Fast. i. 300. *Altiùs humanis exseruisse caput.*

xvii. 7. *Da mihi te facilem.* —

Fast. i. 17. *Da mihi te placidum.* —

xxi. 2. — *verba tulere Noti.*

Rem. 286. — *verba tulere Noti.*

xxii. 11. *Ab! nisi tu dederis.* —

Heroid. iv. 1. *Quâ, nisi tu dederis.* —

xxiii. 2. — *Lenè sonantis aquæ.*

Amor. iii. 5. 6. — *Lenè sonantis aquæ.*

xxx. i. — *muneris omne tui est.*

Trist. i. 5, 6. — *muneris omne tui est.*

xxxiii. 15. *Ille opifex rerum.* —

Met. i. 79. *Ille opifex rerum.* —

xxxvii. 5. *Hoc duce carpe viam.* —

Met. iii. 12. *Hac duce carpe vias.* —

— 35. *Vidi ego (nam memini.)* —

Met. xv. 160. *Ipsè ego (nam memini.)* —

xl. 2. *Gaudet & optat amans.* —

Heroid. xiii. 1. *Mittit & optat amans.*

— 4. — *est mihi dulce queri.*

Heroid. xviii. 82. — *visæ sunt mihi dulce queri.*

i. 17 — *littora bubus aro* — Ita vet. editt.

Heroid. v. 115. — *Littora bubus aras.*

liv. 6. — *quo nil mitius orbis habet.*

Trist. iv. 8. 38. *Mitius immensus quo nihil orbis habet.*

— v. 2, 3. *Cæsare nil ingens mitius orbis habet.*

lvi. 4. — *spicula missa manu.*

Pont. i. 3. 60. — *spicula missa manu.*

lxv. 12. — *pleno copia cornu.*

Met. ix. 88. — *dives bona copia cornu.*

lxvi. 7. — *sub pede colla premit.*

Rem. 330. — *sub pede colla premit.*

lxix. 14. — *dum furit ira maris*

Heroid. xviii. 2. *Si cadat ira maris.* —

— 20. — *causa doloris erant.*

Amor. i. 14. 14. — *causa doloris erant.*

— *Nec socii nostris ingemuere malis.*

Pont. ii. 7. 32. *Sed tamen hi nostris ingemuere malis.*

— 31. — *cum pede pulsat humum.*

Art. i. 112. & Fast. vi. 330. — *tèr pede pulsat humum.*

Trist. iv. 9. 3. *jam pede pulsat humum.*

lxxi. 5. — *teneris qui semper ab annis.*

Pont. ii. 3. 73. — *teneris mihi semper ab annis.*

lxxii. 3. — *palmâ redimita capillos.*

Amor. iii. 103. *Spicis redimita capillos.*

lxxiii. 14. *Lux fuit in pœnas ingeniosa meas.*

Trist. ii. 342. *Inque meas pœnas ingeniosus eram.*

Ibis. 190. *Tuasquè Æacus in pœnas ingeniosus erit.*

lxxiv. 12. — *rerum tutela mearum.* Vide suprâ x. i.



- lxxv, 7. *Jura dat humanis divina potentia rebus.*  
 Pont. iv. 3. 49. *Ludit in humanis divina potentia rebus.*  
 lxxvi. 5. *Dirigere metu.* —  
 Met. vii. 15. *Dirigere metu.* —  
 lxxvii. 5. — *præteriere dies.*  
 Fast. ii. 34. — *præteriere dies.*  
 — 7. — *ferre negabit opem.*  
 Pont. iii. 6. 20. — *ferre negavit opem.*  
 lxxviii. 70. — *lanigerosque greges.*  
 Met. iii. 585. & vi. 395. *lanigerosque greges.* —  
 lxxx. ii. — *gelidæ contermina ripæ.*  
 Met. iv. 90. — *gelido contermina fonti.*  
 lxxx. 7. — *ora rigavit aquis.*  
 Amor. iii. 9. 25. — *ora rigantur aquis.*  
 lxxxv. 12. *Et sata cum multo fœnore reddet ager.*  
 Pont. i. 5. 26. *Et sata cum multo fœnore reddit ager.*  
 xc. 4. — *freno non remorante.* —  
 Fast. vi. 772. — *freno non remorante.* —  
 — 15. — *compensa tristia latis.*  
 Fast. vi. 463 — *miscentur tristia latis.*  
 xcv. i. — *et pede pulset humum. Vide supra lxi. 31.*  
 — 6. *Si modò fert animus.* —  
 Met. i. 775. *Si modò fert animus.* —  
 cii. 6. — *implet loca sola querelis.*  
 Fast. iv. 481. — *loca cuncta querelis Implet.*  
 — 13. — *votis sæpe petita meis.*  
 Amor. iii. 7. 2. — *votis sæpe petita meis.*  
 ciii. 8. — *non patienter amat.*  
 Heroid. xix. 4. — *non patienter amo.*  
 — 14. — *quâ simus origine nati.*  
 Met. i. 415. — *quâ simus origine nati.*  
 civ. 22. — *caput extulit undis.*  
 Met. v. 487. *Cum caput Eleis Alpheias extulit undis.*  
 cvi. 38. — *sanguine tinxit humum.*  
 Fast. vi. 82. — *sanguine tinxit humum.*  
 cx. 4. — *solvens talibus ora modis.*  
 Met. i. 181. *Talibus inde modis ora indignantia solvit.*  
 cxvi. 11. — *verba carere fide.*  
 Heroid. ii. 26. — *verba carere fide.*  
 cxix. 63. *Si quis in hoc populo est.*

Art. i. 1. *Si quis in hoc artem populo.* —

Trist. i. 1. 17. *Si quis ut in populo.* —

cxx. 6. *Inter inhumanos cur ego vivo Getas.*

Pont. i. 5. 66. *Inter inhumanos esse poeta Getas.* See above p. 51.

cxxi. 4. *Adde fidem dictis.* —

Heroid. xii. 194. *Adde fidem dictis.* —

cxxii. 3. — *maximus orbis habet.*

Falt. i. 600. — *maximus orbis habet.*

cxxx. 2. *Supplicis exaudi gemitus.*

Pont. ii. 9. 5. *Supplicis exaudi — vocem.*

cxxxvii. 1. *Lacrymæ fluminis instar erant.*

Heroid. viii. 62 — *Lacrymæ fluminis instar eunt.*

cxix. 19. *Sit procul à nobis,* —

Heroid. iv. 75. *Sint procul à nobis.* —

cxlv. 12. *Crescet & implebit solis utramque domum.*

Heroid. ix. 16. *Implēsti meritis solis utramque domum.*

— 18. *Ibit in amplexus protinus ille tuos.*

Heroid. xvi. 86. *Ibit in amplexus pulchrior ipsa tuos.*

cxlix. 8. — *manibus post terga revinctis.*

Amor. i. 2. 31 — *manibus post terga revinctis.* Ita antiqq. editt. al. *retortis.*

I omit some smaller *Scraps* or *Bits*,\* as you call them, *Suppl. p. 35.* as also that whole Line, taken from that same Author,

*Cedere jussit aquam, jussa recessit aqua.*

of which too much is said already. *Vide supra, p. 329.*

I do not blame *Johnston* for these Things, which in the main it was impossible for him, or *Buchanan*, or any other Poet whatsoever, to avoid. But with what Conscience could you condemn it as a very gross Crime in *Buchanan*, that he did that which your Favourite has done? especially as (which I cannot say of all *Johnston's* above cited *Borrowings*) had *Buchanan* never seen *Ovid*, he could not possibly have hit upon three Words more apposite to his Purpose, or which were fitter to express that most shining Part of that incomparable Lady's Character,

Z 3

\* Of these we will probably have Occasion to speak afterwards, when we come to vindicate *Ovid* from the Injuries with which you have so unworthily treated him.

rafter, *antevenis* — *morum nobilitate genus*.

You are no less unjust to the 3d Distich.

*Accipe (sed facilis) cultu donata Latino*

*Carmina, fatidisci nobile Regis opus.*

Of which you say, "That the Sense and Versification  
" of these two Lines are not to be objected to." This  
is a great Compliment to *Buchanan* from you, and his  
Friends ought to thank you for it, were it not that you  
immediately add, "But as for the Language, *nobile* is a  
" mere Expletive. *A noble Work of a King* is in the  
" Burlesque Stile; *immortal* or *divine* would have added  
" something to the Sense, but *noble* abases it. Not to  
" mention that *nobilitate genus* in the former Couplet  
" comes too close upon *nobile regis opus* in this." What  
you mean by your Distinction between the *Sense* and the  
*Language* I understand not. For if the *Sense* is good, I  
do not see how the *Language* should be bad, unless the  
Words should be improper to express it: Which I think  
cannot be pretended here. But the Word *nobile* is a  
*mere expletive*, &c. Be that as it will, the *Word* in itself  
is innocent, and the Fault lies not in it, but in him, who,  
through Want of *Sense*, brought it in idly and impertinently.  
You ought therefore (had there been Ground  
for it) rather to have said that the *Versification* and  
*Language* were good, but the *Sense* bad.

But to come to the Matter itself: It is a new and hitherto, to me at least, an unheard of Doctrine, that the  
Word *nobilis*, which is the same originally with *nosibilis*  
or *notabilis*, noted, remarkable, great, excellent, should abase  
any Person or Thing it is joined with, and particularly to call  
the Work of a King *nobile*, is to burlesque, i. e. mock or jeer him.  
What? Is every thing that a King does *noble*, and (tho' it were)  
is it a mocking him to call it so? If a King takes a Walk, wipes  
his Nose, smells a Flower, eats an Egg, diverts himself at any  
Game, and innumerable such like Actions, which are common  
to him with other Men, are they therefore great and remarkable,  
because done by him? Nay, have not many Kings done Actions  
*ignoble*, *base* and *unworthy* of them? and are these for all that  
*noble* in them? But further, do  
not



not Kings a great many Actions that are useful and necessary in the ordinary Course of their Government, which yet, because of the Commonness them, do not deserve to be call'd *noble*? I thought that that Name belong'd only to those Actions, even of *Kings*, that were *signally great and excellent*, such as the gaining of a considerable Victory over a formidable and malicious Enemy, by their own Conduct and Valour; the relieving a great Number of Persons in extreme Want or Misery, by a seasonable and unusual Bounty or other Assistance; the building of some grand Edifice, as that of the Temple by King *Solomon*; the compiling a Body of excellent Laws, as that of the Emperor *Justinian*, the reducing of a perverse and licentious People to the Rules of Justice and good Order, as that of our King *James I. of Scotland*; the civilizing of a barbarous Nation, as that of the late Czar of *Muscovy*, therefore call'd *Peter the Great*; and, to go no further, the composing a great Number of Divine Hymns and Psalms, for the publick and private Worship of the true God, which was the Performance of the pious King *David*, here mentioned. These are Works truly *great, remarkable and glorious*, and therefore may and ought most justly to be call'd *noble*, in the highest Acceptation of the Word. It is in this Sense, that *Ovid* styles *Virgil's Aeneid nobile opus*;\* and *Horace*, for his extraordinary Abilities in *Lyrick Poetry*, does not stand to call himself *Aolio carmine nobilem*. And, what comes yet nearer to our Purpose, the same Author calls the Works of that much celebrated Stoick Philosopher *Panaetius, libros nobiles*, Od. i. 29. 13. But why should I mention these, when, of the Works of the great *GOD* himself,

Z 4

\* *Muretus* and *Cicofanus* would have it read *epos* instead of *opus*, and so some Editions have it. But *Heinsius*, who attests that all the MSS. Copies have *opus*, and after him *Burman*, approve of the common Reading. Mr. *Markland* however, after his bold Way, will still, in Spire of all the MSS. have us to read *epos*; because forsooth, the Words *nobile opus*, plac'd absolutely and by themselves, do not necessarily denote an *Epic Poem*. Tho' I think there is something in the Word *nobile* that points that Way, yet at least *Virgil's* Name which is added, will fix it to the *Aeneid*; as the *grande Maronis opus* does in *Martial*, *Epig. v. 5*. See *Markl. on Stat. Sil. l. 2. 250. and iv. 7. 3*.

self, some are more *stated* and *common*, others are more *wonderful* and *remarkable*, and therefore may be design'd *notable* or *noble*? Thus it is said in the Litany. *Our Fathers have declared unto us the noble Works that thou didst in their Days.* And so in the old Translation, Ps. cvi. 2. *Who can express the noble Acts of the Lord:* and Ps. cl. 2. *Praise him in his noble Acts.* Thus also your Favourite Author says of God, Ps. civ. 31. *Gaudebitque operis nobilitate sui,* and Ps. cxxxviii. 2. — *metis Orbis in extremi nobile nomen habes.* But to put the Matter beyond all Dispute, at least you to Silence, this your *Johnston* has borrowed not only the Thought, but also Words from *Buchanan*, in his Dedication of the *Canticles*:

*Quod fero Pieriis è collibus accipe, Regis*

*Accipe divini nobile Vatis opus.*

where *nobile opus Regis & Vatis* is the same with *nobile opus Regis fatidici*.

As to the Nearness of the Words *nobile* and *nobilitate* to one another, I hope, there is no Occasion for dunning us any more with such Trifles, after what I have said above, p. 268, &c.

Tho' what you have said on the Word *nobile*, is, as I have shewn, absurd enough, yet what you say of the following Couplet,

*Ille quidem Cyrrhâ procul & Permesside lymphâ*

*Pene sub Arctoi sidere nata poli.*

is yet, if possible, more so. In the former you commended the Sense and Versification, but condemn'd the Language; here you commend the Language and Versification (which you say are both very fine) but condemn the Sense. I noted above, that by what you call the Sense in the former Couplet, ought to be understood the Language, and, *vice versâ*, by the Language the Sense: And if so, the Language and Versification in both must be good, whatever Fault may be in the Sense. I am glad in the mean time, that you allow *Buchanan*, through all this Epigram, to have two main Ingredients of poetical Art in him; that his Language is chaste and clear, and his Numbers sweet and harmonious; which is more than generally you will grant him on other Occasions. But what

what signify these, when the chief Qualification, *Judgment* and *good Sense* are wanting?

*Scribendi rectè sapere est & principium & fons*, says *Horace*, and very justly: And *Buchanan*, if we will believe you, being destitute of that principal Talent, has nothing left him, but the Title of a good *Rhymer* or *Verficator*; and that, tho' he dealt mostly in *Cicero's* Writings, yet he had acquired a singular Knack and Faculty of turning his Words and Phrases into tolerable Metre. See above your *Suppl.* p. 10 and 11.

But let us see this new Instance you give of *Buchanan's* Want of *Sense*. Why? you say, "The *Sense* in this *Complet* you are afraid will not bear Examination: The Poet is addressing a Book of Verses to a Queen; he thinks them but very indifferent, and the Reason he gives for it is, that they were made in a Country far from *Parnassus*, almost quite under the North Pole. He seems to have forgot *that* this is the Country, which his Patroness Queen so happily enjoyed after so long a Train of Ancestors. Surely this must pass, at least, for a great Blunder." Did ever Mortal talk at a more wild Rate than this? If these Words of *Buchanan* must pass at least, i. e. at best, for a great Blunder, what should they pass for at most, i. e. the worst? Surely no Name can be bad enough for them. What Stuff have we here? *Buchanan* had forgot that his Patroness was Queen of that Country, where his Verses were produced, and to tell her that her Country lay far from the Seat of the Muses. i. e. had not these Advantages and Encouragements for Learning, that *France*, *Italy*, or, (if you will) ancient *Greece*, and other more Southern Countries had, was a Disparagement or Reproach to the Queen of such a Country. As if any King, Queen or Prince could alter the Situation of their Country, or remove it from a cold to a warm Climate: Or, which is the same thing, could help the natural Imperfections of it, and make its Soil as rich and fruitful as any other: Yes, you'll say that this in itself is very true, but it ought not to have been here told. As if it were improper for a Person, that brought a Present to his own Prince, of Fruit, for



for Example, or the like, withal to tell him, " That it  
 " was the best he could bring him, and, that it was not  
 " better, was owing to the Badness or Coldness of the  
 " Ground that produc'd it," tho' he knew that that very  
 Ground was subject to that Prince.\* Is every King or  
 Prince oblig'd to make all his Subjects happy, wise, learn-  
 ed, &c? or to remove all Impediments of their being so?  
 And is it a Fault to mention these Impediments, and to  
 tell even to Princes that things are what they are? I know,  
 the late famous and very ingenious Bishop *Atterbury*, is  
 said to have changed some Part of this Epigram, thus,

*Accipe, sed facilis, citbaræ donata Latina*

*Carmina fatidici nobile Regis opus:*

*Quod si culta parum, si sint incondita, nostri*

*Scilicet ingenii est, non ea culpa loci.*

*Posse etiam hic nasci quæ sunt pulcherrima, spondet*

*E vultu & genio Scotica terra tuo.*

In which he may seem to fall in with your Opinion:  
 But I rather incline to think that it is nothing but a *lusus*  
*ingenii*, and design'd for a Compliment to that noble  
 Queen, to whose Memory he had justly so great a Re-  
 gard. But whatever is in that, this I am pretty sure of,  
 that, tho' that learned Bishop might not think *Buchanan's*  
 Lines so agreeable to the fulsom Flatteries of our mo-  
 dern Dedications; and that therefore it was not per-  
 haps so proper to apologize for the Meanness of his Per-  
 formance, by what might seem to cast a Reflection upon  
 his Patroness; (tho' as I have said, there is no Ground  
 for such a Thought) yet he would never have said with  
 you, that *this at least must pass for a great Blunder*. And  
 I must add, that as *Buchanan* has conducted this Epi-  
 gram, it was necessary he should mention the Disadvan-  
 tage

\* Thus the Prince of Lyrick Poetry, when inviting his great Friend  
*Mæcenæ* to an Entertainment at his Country House, does not stand  
 to tell him, that the Wine, which he was then to have, was but of a  
 mean and low Kind, *vile Sabinum*, tho the Poet's *Sabine* Farm, where  
 it grew, was owing to the free Bounty of this his generous Patron.  
 See *Hor. Od. i. 20.* and particularly at the End, where he also inti-  
 mates that his Ground did not produce better Wine, than that mean  
 or bad Sort that he had mentioned.

stage he was under, by the Situation he was in, when he compos'd this Work. For it presently follows, " That the Effect of these his disadvantageous Circumstances was so great, that he had once a Mind to suppress or hinder the Publication of it; but that that Queen, whom he thought a good Judge of such Performances, having seen it and given it her Approbation, he durst not disparage the good Opinion she had of it, by refusing to allow its being made publick." And then he concludes with a very high Compliment, " That notwithstanding the low Talent he had in Poetry, which was in some Measure owing to the fore-mentioned Cause, yet her good *Genius*, i. e. *Countenance and Protection*, would perhaps make this his Performance be favourably entertain'd by the learned World, and procure (as it has done) a great Name to its Author." By all which it is plain, that what you condemn as a gross Fault, is not only far from being so, but was absolutely necessary for bringing his Dedication to the *epigrammatick Point*, with which he so happily and elegantly concludes it.

I go on to the 5th Couplet;

*Non tamen ausus eram male natum exponere foetum,*

*Ne mihi displiceant quæ placuere tibi:*

" Here again, *you own*, as to the *Language and Versification* there is no Objection to be made." But you add, " That, as to the rest, i. e. as I take it, *the Sense*, there is something in them to you unintelligible. You understand by the 1st Verse, he says, he did not dare to destroy his *ill born Offspring*.\* But what to make of the pentameter Line you confess (*you say*) yourself ignorant." This is somewhat strange. I thought all the Difficulty lay, not in the *pentameter*, but in the *hexameter*

ter

\* I wonder that you do not here, as on other Occasions, blame the *natum* in this Line, as being a Repetition of the *nata* in the preceding. But you'll allow me to observe, that this is so far from being a Fault, that, to me at least, it seems to carry a particular Emphasis in it: The Author referring this *malè natum* to the foregoing *Penè sub Arctoi sidere nata poli*, and thereby intimating, that the Imperfections of this Work of his, were chiefly owing to the Disadvantage of the Place where it was produced,

ter Line, severals (and, among these, the Editors of *E-pigrammatum Delectus in usum Scholæ Etonensis*) having mistaken the Word *exponere*, as if it signified *to set forth* or *to publish*: Whereas (as you have rightly understood it) the Meaning of it is, *to cast out* or *abandon*, as some cruel Parents did their Children, whom they did not like: Contrary to which is the Word *tollere*, to *nourish* or *bring up*. The Word *exponere* being taken in this its true and proper Sense, nothing to my Apprehension seems more easy than the Meaning of the 2d or *pentameter* Line, *Ne mihi displiceant quæ placere tibi*, "Lest these things should displease me which pleased you, i. e. I durst not destroy my ill born Offspring, or mean Performance: For tho' I had a low Opinion of it myself, yet you were much taken with it; and it did not become me to be displeased with, far less to destroy any thing you thought worthy of your Approbation:"

We are now come to the 6th and last Couplet of the Epigram;

*Nam quod ab ingenio domini sperare nequibant,  
Debebunt genio forsitan illa tuo.*

On which you do well to confess (because, as you just now said, *you do not know what they mean*) "That you cannot tell, how these Lines, which begin with *Nam*, are connected to the former." But now that I have clear'd up the Meaning of them, (which, as to that Part, where you were chiefly puzzl'd, was otherwise pretty obvious) their Connection with the former by the causal Particle *Nam*, will appear to the most ordinary Capacity.

Another Difficulty you raise to yourself from the Word *Genio*: For you add, "Neither can I apprehend in what Sense it is to be taken in this Couplet." But one would think that the Context would have easily discovered in what Sense it is here to be taken, namely, for one's *natural Disposition, Inclination* or *Temper*, and particularly *genio tuo* in this Place signifies your *Favour, Good-liking* and *Approbation*; and being (as here) said of a Person of great Power and Authority, it may denote *Tuition* or *Protection*.

But you conclude, that tho' you knew not the Meaning



ing of *Ne mihi displiceant*, &c. nor how the *Nam* of the next Couplet was connected with it: Neither were you clear as to the Sense of the Word *genio* in this Couplet: Yet, *Hoc unum scio*, "One thing however you are certain of, viz. that *forfitan*, which is brought in here perfectly for the Sake of the Verse, destroys the Sense, be it what it will; for to tell his Patroness in the Conclusion of the Epigram, that his Work may perhaps be some how or other the better for her Protection, is "a Banter instead of a Compliment." I have observed above, that you sometimes pretend Ignorance of things you very well know; and sometimes seem really to be ignorant of what you pretend to be sure of. Of the former we have an Instance before us: For a few Lines above, you tell us, that *you could not apprehend clearly in what Sense* *genio* *is here to be taken*: Here without any Hesitation you find that it signifies *Protection*. Of the latter we have an Example in the Word *forfitan*, which you say, *you are certain* is a very unhappy Word; for tho' it is brought in for the Sake of the Verse, and so one would have thought it should have behaved itself harmlessly at least, yet such is the viperous and mischievous Nature of it here, that it destroys that Bosom into which it was received, i. e. it mars the Sense in the Conclusion of an *Epigram*, where, above all things, it ought to be most perspicuous and poignant. If what you are thus certain of is true, then however excellent the *Genius* of his Patroness might be, I may with equal Certainty pronounce that *Buchanan's* *Genius* was a dull and stupid one, when he, poor Man, did not know that he was really *bantering* Her, whom he thought he was highly *extolling*.

It was artfully done of you, to make nothing more of the *Sperare*, than *to be some how or other the better*, i. e. that his Work, with a *perhaps* too, might receive some small or trifling Advantage from her patronizing it. But you'll allow me to tell you that the *SPERARE* of a Poet, is a thing of a much higher Nature, and takes in no less than Immortality in it. For the Meaning of this last Couplet (which you seem to have less understood,

or

or more cunningly to have misrepresented, than any of the rest) is, " That tho' this his Performance can hope for little from the Mediocrity or low Genius of its Author; yet if you, as you have already shew'd your being much pleased with it, shall continue to countenance and favour it, and to take it, as it were, under your Protection, it will be esteem'd by People of good Sense and Learning, and *perhaps* procure to its Master **A NEVER DYING REPUTATION.**" This is a true Paraphrase of *Buchanan's* Words; and tell me now, whether the *forfitan* is an idle, far less a wrong chosen Word, in this Place. We all know that nothing is more common with our modern Authors, in their Dedications, than to promise themselves fine things from the Greatness, Skill, Learning, and other such like shining Qualities, which they much oftner create than find in their Patrons. But it is as well known, not only by others, but by the Dedicators themselves, that such their pretended Expectations are generally all empty and vain; and that, as the Republick of Learning is of all others the most independent and free, so Persons of good Sense will very little regard, to what King, Prince, Princess, &c. a Book is dedicated; but will pass Judgment upon it, according to its own intrinsic Worth, and much the same, as if it had no Dedication prefix'd to it at all. This at least may be allow'd, that whatever Regard Authors may expect will redound to their Productions from their being inscrib'd to great Personages, yet as that is very small, and generally none, there is no Ground for thinking it a Disparagement to their Patrons; that a *forfitan* or *perhaps* be join'd with such slender Hopes. But whatever is in that, you yourself have given a very good Reason to *Buchanan* to add the Word *forfitan*: He having as it were foreseen, that whatever Respect might for some short Space be paid to his Performance, by its being dedicated to and approved by his Royal Mistress; yet there should arise, in after times, some snarling Criticks, who would, as you have done, and without any Regard to so illustrious a Patroness, utterly depreciate and condemn it. But maugre all these your Cavils, and that

Load

\* 2<sup>d</sup>  
vation,  
Quamvis  
dam: n

Load of Reproach you have thrown upon it, this Work of his will retain *AN IMMORTAL FAME*, and such as —

— *quam nec Jovis ira, nec ignes,*

*Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas.*

I should now touch a little on what you say of the Doctor's *Dedication* of his Paraphrase to the Lady *Marshal*. But, as I have no Inclination to treat him, as you do *Buchanan*, I will do him the Justice to acknowledge, that the Lines are all truly excellent, that they have all the Ornaments and Beauties of the finest Poetry, and that the epigrammatick Wit in them is carried on with great Art, and at last finished with that noble Turn or Point, that is so essential to that Kind of Verse, that hardly any thing can exceed it. The only Fault in them is, that they have too much of the hyperbolick Strain, every thing being exaggerated, not only beyond the Possibility of Belief, but also beyond due Measure.\* In the Beginning this Lady is represented as an absolute *Phoenix*, "That she is the only one that has not her Match in the whole World: That she so far excell'd in Eloquence, Greatness of Mind, Beauty and Wisdom, that the Goddesses, whom the Poets feign'd to be the Standards of Perfection in these sublime Qualities, were nothing to her, or rather the Reverse of what they are suppos'd to be: The Goddess of Persuasion, tongue-ty'd; of Majesty, light and frolicksom; of Beauty, ill-favoured and ugly; of Wisdom, rude and ignorant." And much in the same Strain in the two following Couplets. 'Tis quite otherwise with *Buchanan*: Every thing in his Epigram is not only probable, but, in the main, just and true: The Character he gives to our *Q. Mary*, tho' very great, is no more than what was due to her, and that by the Suffrage of some of her profess'd Enemies. In a Word, the whole of it is conducted in a proper and judicious Manner

\* *Quintilian*. speaking of the Figure *Hyperbole*, has this just Observation, *lib. viii. cap. 6. Sed huius quoque rei servetur mensura quadam. Quamvis enim est omnis hyperbole ultra fidem, non tamen esse debet ultra modum: nec alia magis via ad παραβολήν igitur.*



ner, without any thing that is shocking to Credibility or good Sense, except it be the Poet's great Modesty, and the excessively low Opinion he had of his Performance: Tho' this, if it is a Fault, is a very pardonable one, as being common to him with most Authors, and particularly Dr. *Johnston*, both here and in his Preface.

It is further to be observed, that in this Epigram *Johnston* has ap'd *Buchanan* in his; the same Thought being upon the Matter carried all along through both, as will easily appear to any that will compare them together.

Thus, as *Johnston*'s dedicatory Poem is but an Imitation of that of *Buchanan*, and that in him the Compliments to his Patroness are carried to more than an incredible Height; which are all suitable and just in the other: In these Respects at least *Buchanan* ought to have the Preference. And as I have fully clear'd it from all the Exceptions you have made against it on other Accounts; and as you are forc'd to own that the Versification and Language are truly fine, and no way inferior to that of *Johnston*; there remains no Advantage the one can claim above the other, unless it be in your *Alliterations*, varying of the *Pause*, and the like.

As to these, I have shew'd above, that they are things of the lowest Consideration in Poetry: But, whatever Value you may put upon them, I cannot enough wonder at the Partiality you here discover on their Account. Of *Buchanan*'s 1st Line, *Nympha Caledoniae*, &c. you own that it is *delicately alliterated with the Vowel e five Times in a full Sound*: And of *Johnston*'s 1st Line, *Nympha patri*, &c. you say much the same, that it is *alliterated throughout upon the a*. And you immediately add, "That for that Reason it surpasses *Buchanan*'s." For what Reason? Does not an Alliteration take place in both; in *Buchanan* on Letter *e*, and in *Johnston* on Letter *a*. And do you not call *Buchanan*'s *delicate*, and *Johnston*'s *beautiful*? Wherein then lies the Difference? Why: In this: *Buchanan*'s *e* is alliterated but *five times*, but *Johnston*'s *a* *throughout*. But why do you not number them, as you do *Buchanan*'s? For no other Reason I can see, but to impose upon your Reader with that general Word  
through

throughout. For upon numbering them, I find that *a* alliterated only five times, the very Number of *Buchanan's* Alliterations of the Vowel *e*. And are not five Alliterations of *e* as good as five Alliterations of *a*? And if the Number on each Side is equal, where did you find the Inequality? You tell us afterwards, p. 48. *It is evident, that you undertook this Work of yours, only for the Sake of Truth; and that you have no particular View in this Dispute.* But if this is the Way of finding out Truth, to run counter to one of the first Principles in Mathematicks,\* I am afraid that she is not (as *Democritus* fancied) lurking in the Bottom of some deep Well, whence it may cost some Labour to fetch her; but that she has sunk to the Centre of the Earth, and is not to be found out at all.

But I will deal more fairly with you, than you have done with *Buchanan*, and shew you that in another thing, which you extol as much in Poetry as you do *Alliterations*, I mean the *Affonantie Syllabarum* or *Rhymings*, *Buchanan* has the Heels of *Johnston*. Of these I shall only mention, what you value as much as any, viz. what in your *Pref. Discourse*, p. 41. you call the plain direct Rhyme, or the Chiming of the two Hemistichs. And of these in *Buchanan's* 12 Lines I find no fewer than five, viz. 1 *Caledonia* — ora. 2 *innumeros* — avos. 3 *Cyr-rha* — *lympa*. 4 *Arctoi* — *poli*. 5 *genio* — *tuo*. But in *Johnston's* 14 Lines, I find only two, viz. 1 *Cypris* — *rudis*. 2 *magnos* — *avos*. I am sure then that five are more than two, and that the Odds is besides so great, that put them in a Balance the one against the other, and under what Denomination you please, of Pounds, Ounces, Scruples or Grains, *Buchanan's* Scale must preponderate, or, to use your quaint Phrase, make that of *Johnston* kick the Beam. But I am heartily weary of these Trifles, which nothing but seeing Justice done to *Buchanan* would have obliged me to take any Notice of.

As to the Varying of the Pause or Cæsura in *Johnston's* first hexameter Line, of which you speak as a great

A a

Beauty

---

\* Si aequalibus aequalia addas, &c.

Beauty in him, and you might have added his last Hexameter, in which he has also done the same: I have shew'd above, that in the main it is a thing purely casual: And tho' *Buchanan* happens to have no such Change of the *Cæsura* in these few, *i. e.* only six hexameter Lines of this Epigram; yet he has many of them in the Psalms, where (tho' some of them are of a considerable Length) *Johnston* has none; and in the whole a much greater Proportion than he, as I have likewise demonstrated in another Place. See p. 181.

I pass over your other Flights in Commendation of *Johnston's* Epigram, and shall only take Notice of the invidious Comparison you raise from some of them against *Buchanan*. As 1st, You tell us on *Johnston's* 5th Couplet, that he gives two Reasons why he dedicates his Work to the Lady *Marshall*, *viz.* that she was a religious Woman, and a great Protectress of the Muses. As if it were necessary that in a short Epigram particular Reasons should be given, why a Book should be dedicated to such and such a Patron. And yet in this of *Buchanan* we have both these Reasons upon the Matter, that you mention, tho' not in *Johnston's* over-strain'd Manner. He tells his Royal Patroness that he presents her with a Translation of one of the best Books in the World, *nobile opus fatidici Regis*. The Original she was well acquainted with, and could not fail to make much use of it both in her publick and private Devotions: And I am sorry to add, that the barbarous Treatment she met with from this same *Buchanan*, (when he changed his Note soon after) and her other rebellious Subjects, and particularly her long eighteen Years Imprisonment, and other cruel, as well as unjust, Sufferings in *England*, gave her but too much Occasion to read that Book more than any other. What made it more particularly fit for her to meditate frequently upon, was the very near Resemblance her Condition had to that of its Divine Author, in that both were persecuted by sovereign Princes, Ps. cxix. 161. as well as by their own unnatural Subjects; and that both were compassed about with Words of Hatred, and had Things laid to their Charge that they knew not, Ps. cxix.



cix. 3. and xxxv. 11. But to leave this, which I must own lies heavy upon our Author's Memory\* as an *Historian*, tho' his Character as a *Poet*, (with which alone I am now concerned,) is not in the least affected by it, and to return to your Reasons; do not his Words, *quæ placuere tibi*, furnish us with another for this Dedication? For can there be a better Reason for it, than that his Patroness was much pleas'd with the Work, and that, had it not been for her Approbation of it, he hardly would have suffered it to appear in the World? Ay, but he does not say directly that she was a religious Princess, as *Johnston* says his Countess was. Yes, tho' he does not say it in as many Words, yet he gives a very plain Intimation of it; for if *Q. Mary* was so well pleased with a Paraphrase of the Psalms, she must be much more so with the Original Text: And what is that else than to say that she was religiously disposed?

Another of *Johnston's* Reasons for the Choice of such Patroness, you observe, is, because she was a *Protectress of the Muses*: This *Buchanan* does likewise insinuate, not indeed in *Johnston's* flaunting and hyperbolick Manner, by telling her, as you translate him, that, *to her*, as the great Guardian of the Muses, *his Translation did belong of right, to her to whom the Waters of Helicon are tributary*: But in a Way much more judicious and rational

A a 2

tional

\* This your Favourite, and *Buchanan's* great Admirer was sensible when in his *Hypermorus Medicaster*, or Satyr on Dr. *Egleham*, he has an Apostrophe to our *K. James VI.* whose *Præceptor* our Author had

*Tuque parens patriæ, nisi deliquisset in uno;*

*Quid de te vatem non meruisse putas?*

Imitating by these Words *NI SI DELIQUISSET IN UNO*, the atrocious Injuries he had done, in his History, to the Fame of that excellent Princess, our then King's Mother.

*Catullus*, I am sure, gives the same Reason for dedicating his Book to *C. Nepos*: *Namque tu solebas*, (says he to that learn'd Historian) *esse aliquid putare nugæ*. And, which is yet more, *Pliny the Elder* in his Dedication of that immense Work of his, the most learned that we have extant writ by a Roman, the 37 Books of his natural History, the best of Emperors *Titus Vespasian*, does not stand to use the very same Words of *Catullus*, (*conterranei sui*, as he calls him) as his Reason for so doing.

tional, by saying, " That if this Work of his should  
 " happen to acquire any Reputation in the World, it  
 " would chiefly be owing to his Royal Mistress's good  
 " Genius, i. e. to her Approbation as well as Protection  
 " of it," which supposes her to have had no small Skill  
 in Poetry, if not to have written some Essays of that  
 Kind herself, as we are assured by *Ronsard, Brantome*  
 and others, she actually did: When we know nothing  
 of any such Productions of that other Lady, who per-  
 haps, for all *Johnston* says of her, may not have been ca-  
 pable of understanding the Work he now offers her.

2. In descanting on the Beauties of *Johnston's* last  
 Couplet, you take Occasion to repeat the unjust Cen-  
 sures you had passed before on *Buchanan's* Epigram.  
 " Here, you say, is no *forfitan*, no *perchance*, no *per-*  
 " *plext Thoughts*, no *ænigmatical Expressions*; all is clear  
 " strong and wonderfully proper." To which it is e-  
 nough to answer, that 1st as to the *forfitan*, I have shew-  
 ed already not only the Usefulness, but also (if there is  
 any Weight in your Criticisms) the Necessity of that Ad-  
 dition. As to the *perplext Thoughts* and *ænigmatical*  
*Expressions* you talk of, there was never any thing said  
 more unjustly: For of all that ever put Pen to Paper  
*Buchanan's* Stile is, through all his Works, the most re-  
 mote from such an Imputation; and in this Epigram  
 particularly every thing is plain and most easy to be under-  
 stood, unless it be to those who are either grossly ignorant  
 or affectedly so: Which last, I am afraid, for all your  
 Professions of Truth and Ingenuity, is your own Case.

As to the Conclusion of *Johnston's* Epigram, I confess  
 that it and all the rest, is, as to the Language, very clear  
 and perspicuous, Obscurity being none of that Author's  
 Faults: But then, as to the Sentiments, I am not so well  
 satisfied. *All you say is strong*: But it is too much for  
 every thing being carried to an extravagant and super-  
 etical Height. You add, that it is *wonderfully* prop-  
 I own the Period is delicately turned, and the *Antithesis*  
 beautifully set one against the other: But I can hardly  
 be brought to think that they *properly* agree with what  
 went before. He calls his Patroness *the sovereign Gu-*

lian of the Muses, and tells her, *that all the Waters of Helicon pay tribute to her*, which is of itself a very high and supererogating Flight: But that is not all; for you add that there she reigns with such an exalted Sway and Power, that she can alter the Nature of Things, that *she can give Weight, Light and Life to Verses*, which, as you translate his Words, *were in themselves empty and vile, and would otherwise soon have perished*. This is, in my Opinion, *rem prodigialiter variare*, as Horace expresses it, and little less than what that Author adds,

*Delpbinum silvis appingere, fluctibus aprum;*

and which nothing can excuse, but the beautiful Manner in which, I confess, it is told.

Having thus at full Length gone through all the Objections you have mustered up against Buchanan's Paraphrase, and the Dedication prefixed to it; I leave it to the intelligent and impartial Reader to sum up the Evidence on both Sides; and I think by this time I have, to his Conviction, made it appear, that not only Buchanan's Caledonian Nymph retains her full Lustre, and is so far from having all her Charms eclipsed by those of the other Nymph produced on Johnston's Side, as you affect to speak, *Conclus. p. 4.* that, on the contrary, Johnston's loses a great deal by the Comparison: But also, with respect to the whole of both Performances, I have demonstratively proved what I at first undertook, namely, that Buchanan is not only in general a great Poet, (which every Body, except you and a few Partizans you pretend to have got, believes) but also that (contrary to what you have been endeavouring to make out) this particular Work of his **IS IN EVERY RESPECT SUPERIOR TO THAT OF JOHNSTON.**

But why should I have been at all this Pains, when the worthy Doctor himself was so fully sensible of what he has been advancing? If his Testimony (which one would think should be decisive in this Question, especially, as it is introduced with a *Quid enim manifesta nemus*) is to be taken for it, he hath given it once and again under his own Hand, in the clearest and most pointed Manner. The latter of these is in the Preface to his



Psalms, and comes so home to the Matter in hand, that you have no other Way left to evade its Force, but by turning the whole of it into Irony and Satyr. How far this is from all Appearance of Truth, I have, I think, made out in the Beginning of this Treatise, and therefore shall say no more of it here, than barely to observe, that it is infinitely incredible, that Dr. *Johnston*, who had formerly express'd, in the most open and undisguis'd Manner that was possible, the high Admiration he had of *Buchanan* as a Poet, and particularly of this his Paraphrase, and had shew'd such a keen Resentment of the injurious Treatment he had met with from Dr. *Egleston*, should some few Years after, in a dark and enigmatical Way, *satyrize* and *lampoon* him. For this certainly must be the Case, if what you say is true, towards the Conclusion of this your last Part, p. 47. and 48. where, after a good deal of strange Reasoning, you endeavour to prove that Dr. *Johnston*'s Preface was to be read backwards, and that the high Encomiums he gives to *Buchanan*, his Rival, as you make him, was nothing else but a *fine conceal'd Satyr*, you end with these remarkable Words. "Lastly, say you, how is it possible that he [*Johnston*] who could write the finest Poetry imaginable of all Kinds, should in Reality not know (and, as you insinuate, not tell the World so much, tho' in a hidden and counterfeited Way) how *BAD Buchanan*'s was in every sort, in the Translation we have been considering."\* He that can, after what I have said, believe this of *Johnston*, has a Faith that can swallow down the greatest Absurdities, and among the rest this, that your Book with all its Appendages, is really design'd as a Satyr upon Dr. *Johnston*, and a Panegyrick upon *Buchanan*: For the one is as credible as the other.

I know not whether I should take Notice of what you

---

\* I am told that your Friend Mr. *Lauder* was so fond of this Conceit, that he caused engrave a Print, in which Dr. *Johnston* is represented as mounted on a Chair or Throne, and *Buchanan* on his Knees at his Feet, surrendering up his *Diadem* in a most humble manner to the Doctor, as incomparably more worthy to wear it than himself.

you afterwards subjoin in the same p. 48. " That if you  
 " are for removing the Laurel from the Head of one  
 " *North Briton*, it is to put it on the Head of another :"  
 This is very magisterially spoken. But pray, good Sir,  
 who made you the great *Bezeviths* in *Parnassus*, or gave  
 you Authority to transport Laurels from one Head to  
 another? *Buchanan's* Laurel was put on by incompa-  
 rably better Judges than either you or I are; and in Spite  
 of all the Efforts that you, or I (were I ever so much  
 so inclined) and a thousand more with us can make to  
 pull it off, it will stand firm and unshaken on that Head  
 where it has been, near two hundred Years ago, first  
 placed; and it will be no more in our Power to remove  
 it from that to another, than to make Rivers run back-  
 wards, or to invert the Poles of Heaven. As to *John-*  
*ston's* Laurel, may he long enjoy it,

— *Neque ego illi detrahere ausim*

*Herentem capiti multa cum laude coronam.*

But then I hope I do him no Injury, when I say what  
 he said of it himself, that he ought to veil it to that of  
*Buchanan*.\*

But it is not enough, it seems, with you to take *Bu-*  
*chanan's* Laurel from him, and give it to another; but  
 you will not allow him the smallest Wreath or Coronet  
 in its Place. For you add, " And considering the  
 " whole, it is easy to see how this Matter will end :  
 " *Buchanan* will be always a Person of high Rank in the  
 " learned World, though his Poems should never be  
 " mentioned any more." What is this else than to say,

A a 4

" That

---

\* Witness these Lines of his (which I suppose, he wrote in good  
 Earnest, and not ironically, as you would have him :)

*Non ego dedignor, victus si dicar ab illo,*

*Qui radiis implet solis utramque domum.*

*Cui gens Ausonia prius, et cum Teutone Gallus*

*Cessit, ab hoc vinci cur ego turpe putem?*

*Quem pudet Eacide fatali cuspidе, magni*

*Quem piget Aenea succubuisse manu?*

*Hoc ego me solor, me quod post terga relinquas*

*Musa Caledonii nata sub axe poli.*

*Quo fulget mihi terra parens, patriaque Camana,*

*Non mea dedecorat plestra, sed ornatur honori.*

" That how high so ever a Rank *Buchanan* may possess  
 " in the learned World, upon the Account of his *Histo-*  
 " ry and other *Prose Writings* ; yet as a *Poet* he shall  
 " have none?" Can you be serious in the Matter? or  
 think that these small Pieces of yours will have such a  
 powerful Effect, that it will be easy to see from them,  
 that however *Buchanan's* other Works may be esteem'd,  
 yet his poetical ones, for which he has been chiefly re-  
 nown'd, shall, by the magical Force of a few Dashes of  
 your Pen, be henceforth quite disregarded, and never read  
 or mentioned any more? May I not cry out with the *French*  
 Man in the Play, *Quelle Extravagance!* So great, I be-  
 lieve, that it is hardly to be match'd any where.

But this is but a Part of your mighty Feats, for *Primo*  
*avulso non deficit alter*, for you subjoin, " That as to *John-*  
 " *ston*, he may (by what you have done to him) be look'd  
 " upon as a new Acquisition to the People among whom  
 " he was born." Which is, in other Words, to say, that  
 our *Scots* People were such Dunces and Ideots, that  
 they doated upon *Buchanan's* worthless Trash, when  
 they were possess'd of an inestimable Jewel of *John-*  
*ston's* Paraphrase, but had not the Sense to know its Va-  
 lue, till you were so good as to discover it to them. But,  
 as I told you before, this is nothing but pure Figment:

*Non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora Scoti :*

The *Scots* (who are as good Judges of what is worthy,  
 and as vain of what belongs to them, as their Neigh-  
 bours) I mean such of them, as have a true Taste of  
 fine Learning, (of whom I hope we have still a good  
 Number among us) have always been, and yet are, since  
 their first Appearance, great Admirers of *Johnston's*  
 Poems, and (tho' they are somewhat obliged to you,  
 for the fine Editions you have published of a Part of  
 them) yet they needed not your Information,\* for mak-  
 ing them acquainted with them, and having them in that  
 Esteem which they justly merited.

*Ovid*

---

\* Tho', after all, Mr. *William Lauder*, (a *Scots* Gentleman, and a Per-  
 son otherwise of good Learning and Judgment in these Matters, till he  
 be-



*Ovid* defended.

**Y**OU conclude this your last Piece with a Kind of *Digression*, wherein, p. 49 you fall heavy upon poor *Ovid*, and particularly on his *Trists*; and press hard that *Johnston's* *Psalms* may in the Schools be substituted in their Room. But you are not aware, that if this your Argument proves any Thing, it proves too much. For you say, "The whole Matter is reduced to this single Point, *Whether the Psalms of David and the Evangelick Canticles, as they are called, and the Te Deum, the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and the Ten Commandments*, put into *Latin Verse*, [you add indeed] vastly superior to any Part of *Ovid's* Works, are fitter to be taught in Christian Schools than *Ovid de Tristibus*. This, you say, is the single Question." If you mean that nothing should be taught in *Christian Schools*, but what is writ by not only *Christian* Authors, but also on *Christian* or religious Subjects, then all the ancient *Greek* and *Latin* Poets, *Homer, Hesiod, Virgil, Horace, &c.* not to mention those wrote by *Christians* on Subjects of an indifferent Nature, must, as well as *Ovid's Trists*, be set a packing out of our Schools. But this is what you yourself declare against a little above in this same Page.

But

became intoxicated with an over-weening Opinion of *Dr. Johnston's* Performances) had formed a Design of publishing his *Psalms*, before he heard of yours. At least, I am sure, that his Edition of them came abroad upwards of a Year before yours saw the Light. But the most surprizing thing of all is, that when (as you say p. 45. of your Suppl. you have been credibly informed) *Johnston's* Paraphrase was had in the highest Veneration abroad, and taught in many Schools there for 40 or 50 Years past; yet he was lost to his own Country for almost a Century. It was a proverbial Saying among the Jews, That a Prophet had not Honour in his own Country. But it is the first time I ever heard that it was so with a Poet, or indeed any Writer. The Contest of several Towns of Greece for the Honour of giving Birth to *Homer* is well known. And the Disputes concerning several Saints and other famous Men, whether they were of *Scots, English* or *Irish* Extract, are far from being determined, each Nation to this Day eagerly contending for that Honour.

But if you mean that the Psalms, &c. and other such Books as relate to the *Worship* of the true God, and the *Duties of Christianity*, should be taught in *Christian Schools*, with a Preference to every Thing else, I know no *Christian* will contend with you. But what hinders that other Books, and among these *Ovid's Trists*, may not also together with these, and in their own Place and Order, be taught in such Schools? No *Christian* can always be employ'd in sacred Things: And if *Christianity* not only allows, but also requires its Professors to be taken up with Things of a temporal Concern, whether of a real Use, or an indifferent, provided it be of an harmless Nature; I see nothing that stands in the Way, why *Ovid de Tristibus* may not come in among these. This I am pretty sure of, that of all the ancient poetical Writings, there are none more innocent than that Book, and which is more, (besides the Elegancy and Purity of the Language) that abounds more with instructive Lessons in humane Life, concerning the *Instability of worldly Things*, the *Miseries poor Mortals are often exposed to*, the *Excellency of true*, and the *Baseness of pretended Friendship*, the *Loveliness of Compassion to Persons in Distress*, and the *Hatefulness of the contrary*. All which are display'd in a most lively and affecting manner throughout that whole Work: And, (which can be said of few others,) I know not so much as one Phrase in it that can give the least Offence to the most modest Ear, or any way intrenches upon *Piety* and *good Manners*.

You say that the *Latin Verse*, into which *Johnston* has translated the Psalms, &c. is vastly superior to any Part of *Ovid's Works*. This I have shew'd above to be an ill-grounded Conceit of your own, and in which I much doubt if you will find one single Person in the World will go along with you. It is much the same, and equally without Foundation, with what you advance in your *Suppl. p. 43.* that *Johnston excels all the Writers of the Augustan Age, Virgil excepted*. But if all this were true, as it certainly is not, would it therefore follow, that no other Author should be read in *Christian Schools*, but *Virgil* and *Johnston*? May not *Horace*, *Lucan*, *Juvenal*, and

*Ovid's*

*Ovid's Metamorphoses*, if not his *Trists*, not to mention others, as *Plautus*, *Terence*, *Phædrus*, &c. be also taught there? And tho' *Sallust* and *Livy* are reckoned the chief of all the *Roman* Historians, may we not however in our Schools read some others of them, such as *Cæsar*, *Nepos*, *Sueton*, *Tacitus*, *Justin*, &c? You see how far your ill-founded Reasonings would carry us.

But among all the Authors, which we call *Classical*, there is none you ought less to contemn, nay, I add, to have a higher Opinion of, if you have that Regard that you pretend for Dr. *Johnston*, than *Ovid*. For there is none that will read and carefully compare both together, but must in a short time be convinc'd that *Ovid* is the great Pattern and Exemplar that *Johnston* every where, as well in his *Psalms* as other Works, has followed. The same Luxuriancy, and, I may say, Gaiety of Fancy, the same sprightly and beautiful Turns of Wit, the same Elegance and Fluency, the same Easiness and Perspicuity of Expression; in a Word, the same poetical Style or Diction appear in both; that among all that have writ *Elegiacks*, either ancient or modern, there is none so much resemble one another as *Johnston* does *Ovid*; in so much, that (to use their way of speaking) one would be apt to think that both have been inspired by the same Muse. You talk much of *Johnston's* imitating *Virgil*, and learning his Art from him: But upon a more strict Examination into the Matter, it will be found that *Johnston* has chiefly learned his Art from *Ovid*, and formed it upon his Plan; and tho' he has borrowed some Phrases and Expressions from *Virgil*, as he has also from *Lucretius*, *Horace* and others, yet he has taken more from *Ovid* than he has done from almost all the Poets of the *Augustan* Age put together. It was therefore very unadvisedly done of you to vilify and run down an Author, for whom your Favourite had so great a Regard, and to whom he was so much beholden.

But after all, what is it that in Fact should render that Author so despicable in your Eyes? I know he is generally blam'd for giving too loose a Rein to his Fancy, which made him oftentimes say too much, and not to stop  
when



when he had said enough, But this Fault, which in itself is not so grievous as it is commonly represented, is abundantly compensated, by the other inimitable Beauties, the lively Turns of Wit and Imagination, and all the most delicate Ornaments of true Poetry that shine through his whole Works: In so much that even in those Places, where he seems to have over-acted the Point, and to have said more than what was fit and proper, yet his Thoughts are delivered in such an agreeable and delightful Manner, that I would not willingly want any part of them. Of innumerable Instances of that kind, I shall only mention one: It is in his *Metamorph. lib. viii.* where describing the insatiable Hunger, which the Goddess *Fames* (whom *Ceres* had employ'd for that Purpose to punish him for cutting down her Grove) did possess *Erisichthon* with, he has these admirable Lines;

*Lenis adhuc sompnus placidis Erisichthona pennis  
Mulcebat: petit ille dapes sub imagine somni,  
Oraque vana movet, dentemque in dente fatigat;  
Exercetque cibo delusum guttur inani:  
Proque epulis tennes nequicquam devorat auras.  
Ut verò est expulsa quies, furit ardor edendi:  
Perque avidas fauces immensaue viscera regnat.  
Nec mora: quod pontus, quod terra, quod educat aër,  
Poscit; & appositis queritur jejunia mensis:  
Inque epulis epulas querit: quodque urbibus esse  
Quodque satis populo poterat; non sufficit uni.  
Plusque cupit, quo plura suam demittit in alvum.  
Utque fretum recipit de tota flumina terra,  
Nec satiatur aquis, peregrinosque ebibit amnes:  
Utque rapax ignis non unquam alimenta recusat,  
Innumerasque trabes cremat; & quo copia major  
Est data, plura petit, turbâque voracior ipsâ est:  
Sic epulas omnes Erisichthonis ora profani  
Accipiunt poscuntque simul: cibus omnis in illo  
Causa cibi est; semperque locus fit inanis edendo.*

The great Scaliger, *lib. v. cap. 8. p. m. 653.* comparing *Ovid* with the Greek Poet *Callimachus*, among others brings in this as an Example of the Superiority of the former above the latter, And after he has said, *Qua ve-*

*rd argutè acutèque, ac plusquam humano ingenio profectus est, non pigebit ascribere: And ipso in somno esurientem, Dii boni! cujusmodi? He sets down the whole Passage, Lenis adhuc somnus, &c. And then adds, In quibus eam vides vim sententiarum, quam nemo est Græcorum consequutus. Nam qualia illa, Inque epulis epulas quærit. Et de igne, copiâ fieri voraciorem. Et — cibus omnis in illo Causa cibi est: &c, semperque locus fit inanis edendo.*

Here we see how high an Opinion, that Prodigy of Learning, as well as great Poet and Judge of Poetry, has of the Author whom you so much despise. And tho' in this Description *Ovid* seems to dwell too much upon, and to repeat as it were again and again the same thing; yet I believe, because all is express'd in such a beautiful and charming Manner, there are very few that would choose to be depriv'd of any part of it. *Ovid* is universally acknowledged to have been the most ingenious of all the *Roman* Poets; and as he was a Gentleman by Birth, and of better Extract than most of them, so his Stile is the most genteel and easy, and farthest removed from all Stiffness and Asperity, of any of them. Some, I know, prefer *Propertius*, and others *Tibullus* before him; for which I could never yet discover any good Reason. This is certain that he has rendred his *Elegiacks*, especially in the *Pentameter* Line, much more smooth, sweet and musical than any that lived with or before him. He generally concludes that Line with a Dissyllable, and not, as *Propertius* and *Tibullus*, who very frequently, especially the former, end it with Words of four or five, and (which is most ungrateful of all) with those of three Syllables. The *doctus Catullus*, tho' his Sentiments and Diction are otherwise noble and excellent, yet his Numbers are often very rough and harsh; and the same is said of *Gallus*, who is now lost. But *Ovid* in Point of Harmony, which is one of the chief Ingredients in Poetry. has exceeded them all: And on that Account, as well as having wrote more in that kind of Verse than all the *Roman* Poets that we have now extant of that Age put together,

ther, it was no unbeseeming Vanity in him, to say of himself, *Remed. Am. v. 395.*

*Tantum se nobis Elegi debere fatentur,  
Quantum Virgilio nobile debet opus.*

I thought fit to say thus much, and I might have added more, in Vindication of that great and illustrious Poet, whom (I cannot imagine for what Reason) you have so often and so inconsiderately endeavoured to rob of that just Honour, which all good Judges \* have hitherto thought his due.

There

\* Of these I shall give you the Words of a few.

*Olaus Borrichius in Conspect. Auct. L. L. p. 38.*

“ Exstant OVIDII Metamorph. libri xv. non illo quidem stilo sublimi epico, sed tamen decore, arguto, numerofo exarati, & vel hoc uno ingeniofiffimi, quod miro artificio omnes propemodum veterum fabulas ab initio orbis ad sua ufque tempora perpetuâ ferie & quasi catenâ amabili connectant. Heroides & Amorum libri puriffimæ dictionis sunt, impuri plerumque sensûs. Tristium libri & Pontica creduntur humiliora esse ceteris ejus operibus, ut inter barbaros in exilio nata, sed sanè quantum iis periit splendoris, tantum ex ingenio additum varietatis et pulchritudinis.

*Morhofius Polyhist. lit. lib. iv. c. 11.*

“ Si quis OVIDII Elegias, in primis Heroïdum epistolas præ manibus sumat, & in suas sententias atque ornamenta resolvat, statim artificium deprehendet quod in illis summum est. Ovidius enim, ut erat cultiffimo ingenio, ita nihil quicquam omisit in ornando carmine, Elegia præsertim, aded ut quibuldam nimius videretur, qui declamatorias in illo argutias notant, SED NON EST UT IL-  
LORUM JUDICIA MOREMUR.

*Jo. Nic. Funccius, de virili ætate Lat. linguæ, cap. 3. p. 265.*

“ Stilius OVIDII ubique perspicuus & suavis est. In sensu æquè ac verbis admiranda facilitas agilitasque deprehenditur; tantaque puritas in maxima copia & argumenti varietate, ut detractis numeris plurima ad venustæ eloquentiæ formam deduci, & cognitio Latinitatis mirificè ex ingenio illius propagari possit.

*Jo. Gul. Bergerus, Prop. poet. 3.1*

“ Uterque. i. e. Val. Flaccus & Statius, ab Homeri Virgillique proposito discessit. OVIDIUS utroque superior & ingenio & ætate varium pulcherrimumque Metamorphoscôn opus heroï quidem car-  
“ minis,



There is only one Thing more I have to take Notice of, and I shall conclude with it, *viz.* the signal Contempt you show to *Ovid* in your Notes upon the Doctor's Paraphrase, and the no less signal Partiality you discover to him on that Account. There is no Author, as I said, among all the Ancients, to whom *Johnston* has been so much obliged, and whose Diction he has so much imitated, as *Ovid*. And yet this notwithstanding, when in these your Notes you go about to illustrate him by the same or similar Passages in those old Authors, you rarely mention *Ovid*, even where it was most pat to your Purpose, and the Words and Phrases were manifestly borrowed from him and none other. For this Conduct of yours I can give no other but one or both of these two above mentioned Reasons. 1<sup>st</sup>, Your singular Neglect or Disesteem of that otherwise very valuable Author. Or 2<sup>dly</sup>, That if you should have particularly marked all, or a great many of the Passages Dr. *Johnston* has borrowed from him, you should bring a Tash of *Plagiarism* upon the Doctor, and thereby give Occasion to his being branded with the same Fault, which you have unjustly endeavoured to fasten upon *Buchanan*. It will be but a sorry Excuse for this Method you have taken, when you tell us in your Preface, "*Ad dictionis puritatem & elegantiam illustrandam similes locutiones, ex Virgilio præsertim, in notis sunt adductæ, quem unum imitandum Auctor noster sibi proposuit.*" That he has imitated *Virgil* in some Places, I shall readily acknowledge; and so

---

" minis, quod epici dignitatem gravitatemque sustinet ac tuetur, numeris adstrinxit.

*Franc. Floridus Sabinus, Apologia in Linguae Lat. Obtretractores.*

" Tanta semper omnibus admirationi OVIDIUS fuit, ut non ingeniosus, sed ingenium ipsum; non Latinus, sed ipsa Latinitas; non Musarum sacerdos, sed ipsum Musarum numen sit habitus.

*Et paullo post.*

" Quod autem ad Latinam linguam attinet, eruditi omnes uno ore consentunt, si funditus illa esset amissa, unius autem OVIDII scripta exstarent, ex illis commodissime posse restitui.

so has *Buchanan*, as well as he. But that *Virgil* was his chief, far less only *Pattern*, is so far from being true, that, as I said, and every body will upon comparing them soon perceive, this same contemptible *Ovid* was the chief Exemplar he proposed for his Imitation, both in this and all his other Works. This (besides his own natural Genius) the kind of Verse he has almost universally chosen, the very same that *Ovid* for the most part, and *Virgil* hardly at all, made use of, could not fail to lead him into. As a Proof of this, I have given a good Number of Passages all taken from *Ovid*, as you may see above, p. 354. & seqq. and yet you have not thought fit to cite *Ovid*, or indeed any other Author, whence *Johnston* had so much as any one of them. Only on that in *Pf.* xxx. 1. — *muneris omne tui est*, you refer us to your Note on *Pf.* xix. 14. *munus id omne tuum est*, where you cite *Horace*, *Od.* iv. 3. 21. And on *Pf.* cxxii. 3. you refer us to xviii. 31. where you cite — *te maximus orbis Accipiat*, from *Virgil*.

It is especially remarkable that, tho' you might have known, that in *Pf.* cxxx. 3.

*Si quoties peccant mortales, mente recondas,  
Pars quota quæ mittes fulmina, ferre queat.*

Orig. If thou, Lord, should mark Iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? *Johnston* has borrowed a great deal both of the Sentiment and Words from that of *Ovid*,

*Si quoties peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat  
Jupiter, exiguo tempore inermis erit,*

yet you do not in the least take Notice of it.

Of the same kind are,

*Pf.* xxxviii. 3. *Nec locus est plagis vulneribusque novis.*

*Ovid.* *Pont.* ii. 7. 42. *Vixque habet in nobis jam nova  
plaga locum.*

• xxxix. 7. *Ancora tu nostræ, cum furit unda, rati es.*

*Trist.* v. 2. 41. *Ancora jam nostram non tenet ulla ratem.*

*Pont.* iii. 2. 6. *Tu lacera remanes ancora sola rati.*

xlv. 13. *Pallaque Sidoniis ter \* saturata cadis.*

*Met.* xi.

\* *Johnston* has here overstrained the Point, or it is an Error of the Printers, *ter* for *his saturata*. For the Tyrian Purple was only double dyed, whence

Met. xi. 166. *Verrit humum Tyrio saturata murice palla.*

Fast. ii. 106. *Induerat Tyrio bis tinctam murice pallam.*

l. 21. *Nam tua sunt digitis facta notata meis.*

Heroid. i. 62. *Traditur huic digitis charta notata meis.*

cxli. 5. *Tristia quod medicâ vulnera sanat ope.*

Pont. i. 3. 6. *Lenito medicam vulnere sensit opem.*

— 8. *Ne precor, ah! timidæ desere vela ratis.*

Fast. i. 4. — *timidæ dirige navis iter.*

cxlv. 13. — *Nil hic tempora juris habent.*

Trist. iii. 7. 48. *Cæsar in hoc potuit juris habere nihil.*

In all which (and I might add some others) it is, I think, pretty apparent, that, however much you pretend the contrary, *Conclus. p. 31.* these Words of *Ovid* did occur to *Johnston's* Thoughts when he wrote his. And yet you refer not to that Author for any of them, except one, viz. *Pf. xxxix. 7.*

Nay further, there are some Words and Phrases, which seem very much peculiar to *Ovid*, at least, not us'd by any other Poet of the *Augustan* Age, which *Johnston* has not scrupled to borrow from him. Such as,

*Pf. xii. 4.* and *lviii. 6. lupus*, for *lupatum*, from *Ovid*, *Trist. iv. 6. 4.*

*xxxvii. 14. lunavit*, for *flexit* or *curvavit*, from *Amor.*

*i. 1, 23.*

*lxviii. 35. lxxxix. 52. and cxxxviii. 8. perennare*, for *in perpetuum durare*, from *Art. iii. 42.* and *Fast. i. 171.*

*xxxiii. 2. stamen*, for *chorda*, from *Met. xi. 169.*

Thus likewise,

*ii. 1. non profecturas minas*, and *cxxxix. 20. nil profectu- ro ore*, *Met. xiii. 411.* and *Heroid. v. 116.*

*iii. 4. & passim, rebus in arctis*, *Pont. iii. 2. 25.*

*viii. 7. buccera armenta*, *Met. vi. 395.\**

B b

xvi. 2.

whence it was call'd *dibapha*. Thus *Hor. Od. ii. 16. Te bis Afro Mu- rice tincta Vestiunt lana*, and *Epist. xii. 21. Muricibus Tyriis iterata vel- lera lanae. Stat. Theb. ix. 690. bis OEbalio saturatam murice pallam. Ti- bul. iv. 2. 15. — cwi mollia caris Vellera det fucis bis madefacta Tyros.* See *Heinsius* on that above cited Line of *Ovid, Fast. ii.* and *Bronkhuisius* on this of *Tibullus*.

\* *Lucretius* has also *buccera secla. vi. 1240.* and *bucceriaque greges.* And here I cannot omit taking Notice, that your Annotator de- rives



- xvi. 2. *demeruisse cultu.* Ad. Liv. 131.  
 xxii. 14. *more novæ ceræ.* Pont. i. 2. 58. See also Pf. xcvi. 5  
 xxxv. 18. *femina virque.* Art. ii. 478. Art. iii. 800. Remed. ult.  
 xxxvii. 18. lxxxix. 52. and cxxxviii. 8. *dempto fine.* Heroid. i. 50.  
 xlii. 9. *portus & aura.* Heroid. i. 110. al. *portus et ara.*  
 lvi. 9. *dexter ades.* Fast. i. 6. See also Pf. lxiv. 2.  
 lxi. 18. cix. 31  
 Ibid. *nota loquor.* Met. ii. 570.  
 lxiv. 7. *mors properata.* Trist. iii. 3. 34.  
 lxxv. 1. and xcvi. 1. *ire per laudes.* Fast. i. 15.  
 cvi. 18. *impete vasto.* Met. iii. 79.  
 cix. 7. *calculus ater.* Met. xv. 44.  
 ——— 16. *pars potior.* Pont. iii. 2. 25.  
 cxiii. 5. *quæ patet orbis.* Trist. iv. 9. 20. and v. 14. 34.  
 cxvi. 10. *verba libera.* Fast. i. 52.  
 cxxiii. 4. *otia ducere.* Pont. i. 5. 43.

But what seems most unfair of any, you often cite *Virgil*, and sometimes other Authors, where Quotations from *Ovid* had been much more clear and apposite to the Purpose. Of these take the few following Instances.

- Pf. i. 1. — *impuro cum grege carpit iter.*] *Horace*, Od. ii. 17. 12. *carpere iter comites parati*, here cited. But that of *Ovid*, *Fast.* iii. 604. — *nudo dum pede carpit iter*, had been more to the Purpose. And that of *Martial* *Epig.* iii. 91. 2. — *cum grege junxit iter*, yet more.  
 ——— 3. *lene fluentis aquæ*] *Lenè* used here adverbially, for which *Torvum clamat* and *Acerba tuens* are cited from *Virgil*: When the very Words are to be found in *Ovid*, *Amor.* iii. 5, 6. and *Fast.* ii. 704. and *Fast.* vi. 340.  
 save

rives the Word *bucerus* from the Greek βὺς valde, and αἰγας cornu, and adds, *per armenta buccera igitur intellige greges cornutorum animalium.* Whereas it is manifest that the former Part of the Composition is βὺς, bos, and the Word is only applied to Oxen, as it is here by *Johnston*. *Bucorum pecus de bubus dicimus*, says *Festus*, and so it is used by *Lucretius*, lib. ii. v. 660. *Lanigera pecudes, & equorum duellica proles, Buceraque greges*, where the *bucera greges* or Oxen are distinguished from *Sheep* and *Horses*; the former of which have Horns as well as Oxen.

ave only that he has *sonantis* for *fluentis*: As *Johnston* himself has it, *Pf. xxiii, 2.*

iii. 5. — *sub noctem.*] *sub lucem* cited from *Virgil*, when *Ovid* has *sub noctem*, in *Met. iv. 79.* and elsewhere.

xx. 5. *compos voti.*] *Voti reus*, cited from *Virgil*: When *Ovid* has the very Words *compos voti*, *Art. i. 486.* By the by the Annotator says that *compos voti*, and *voti reus* signify the same Thing, which is far from being always true, for *reus voti*, as also *damnatus voti*, is he who having made a Vow of some Offering to any God, is bound upon obtaining of what he wish'd or pray'd for, to make good his Vow: But *compos voti*, is he who has obtain'd what he wish'd or pray'd for, whether he made any such Vow or not.

xxx. 24. — *hoc deprecor unum.*] Upon these Words we have this Note; *Sæpius precor & deprecor sunt contraria: hic verò deprecor significat valde seu vehementer precor.* And then he cites that Verse of *Catullus* for it, *Epig. 87. al. 90.*

*Cui ego, quasi eadem totidem mox deprecor illi*

*Affiduc: verum dispeream nisi amo.*

where the true reading is *Quo signo? quasi e. t. m. deprecor illi.* But whatever is in that, the Annotator is here doubly mistaken, both with Respect to his Author and to *Catullus*: In neither of whom is *deprecor* used for *valde precor*: The *deprecor* in *Johnston* being manifestly taken in a contrary Sense to *precor*, this last being generally used for *to pray that a thing may happen*; and the former, in the most usual Sense, for *to pray that a thing may not happen*, as appears from the following Line.

*Me victo, ne gens hostica cantet Fo.*

And in the same Sense is it taken in that Place of *Catullus*. For thus *Vulpinus*, after *Scaliger*, explains it, *Id sibi vult Catullus, Tanquam male dicta illa omnia quæ in me jact Lesbia [v. preced.] non ego continuo à me rejiciam, & in ejus caput convertam, nullo penitus de summa detractò.* This *A. Gellius*, *Noct. Att. vi. 16.* had long ago observed, for there he condemns one that had taken it in the same Sense that your Annotator does, for *valde*

*precor, oro or supplico*, and shews that the *de* in *deprecor* *diversitatem significationis capit*, and adds, *Deprecor in Catullo dictum est quasi detestor vel execror, vel depello, vel abominor*. And in this Sense it is that *Ovid* constantly uses it, as *Pont.* i. 2. 59. *ſ*.

*Sæpe precor mortem, mortem quoque deprecor idem*, and particularly *Heroid.* ix. 159. and *Met.* ii. 98. *Deprecor hoc unum*, whence *Johnston* has probably borrowed the Phrase.

xli. 3. *Ponet & in molli languida membra toro.*] *viridante toro* here cited from *Virgil*, when we have most of the Line in *Ovid*, *Pont.* iii. 3. 8. *Fusaque erant toto languida membra toro*.

cii. 6. — *noctis avis.*] *Noctua* here cited from *Virgil*, when *Ovid* calls that Bird expressly *noctis avem*. *Met.* ii. 564. and *Fast.* vi. 159.

civ. 16. *Silvarumque potens*] *Virgil's tempestatum potentem* here cited. But *Ovid's Diva potens frugum*, *Amor.* iii. 10. 35. and *Horace's O Naiadum potens*, *Od.* iii. 25. 14. but especially *Silvarumque potens*, *ſ*. i. of his *Carm. secul.* had been more proper; it being very probable that *Johnston* had this last in his View. So that what the Annotator adds here, *Hoc in loco, ut ubique, à Marone edoctus est noster*, is very far from being true.

cvii. 23. *velivolis puppibus.*] *Mare velivolum* of *Virgil* here cited: But *Ovid's velivole rates*, *Pont.* iv. 5. 42. had been more pat.

cxxix. 7. *maturis implet aristis.*] *Gravidis aristis* here cited from *Virgil*: But *maturis albescit* — *aristis* in *Ovid*, *Fast.* v. 357. was more close.

From these, and many other Instances I have given above, he must be strangely prejudiced that does not see, that the Doctor had a very different Opinion of *Ovid* from what you have, when he has more frequently imitated and borrowed from that Author, than any other whatsoever.

But not only from *Ovid*, but also from *Buchanan* himself, has the Doctor thought fit to take Assistance. Witness the following Examples.

ii. 6. — *succo viridantis olivæ,*

*Buch.*



- Buch. Pf. civ. — *succus viridantis olivæ.\**  
 xxii. 28. — *rerum moderatur habenas.*  
 Buch. Pf. lxxviii. 1. *orbem moderaris habenis,*  
 xv. 5. — *stat nullo mobilis ævo.* See also Pf. cii. 12.  
 Buch. Pf. civ. 5. — *stat nullo mobilis ævo.*  
 xxx. 2. — *et tua facta canam.* See also Pf. lvi. 12.  
 Buch. cxxxviii. *Et tua facta canam.*  
 xxxiii. 10. *Impia sacrilegæ diffat molimina turbæ.*  
 Buch. i. 1. *Impia sacrilegæ flexit contagio turbæ.*  
 xxxvi. 8. *Te pandente manum,*  
 Buch. civ. 28. *Te magnam pandente manum.*  
 xlii. 8. *tu mihi carmen eris.* See also lxiii. 3. and lxxi. 5.  
 Buch. lxxxix. 1. *Tu mihi carmen eris.*  
 lxxviii. 27. — *Nepthalidæque duces.*  
 Buch. lxxviii. 27. *Nepthalidæque duces.*  
 lxxix. 5. *Simplicitas tibi nota mea est.*  
 Buch. lxxix. 5. *Simplicitas tibi nota mea est.*  
 lxxxiv. 2. *Cor micat, exultant fibræ.*  
 Buch. xlv. 1. *Cor micat, exultant—præcordia fibris,*  
 lxxxvi. 15. — *pollicitique tenax.*  
 Buch. lxxi. 15. *tenacem polliciti.†*  
 xcii. 4. *Hinc quoque lætitiæ surget origo meæ.*  
 Buch. cxxxvii. 6. *Hinc nisi lætitiæ surgat origo meæ,*  
 xcvi. 4. — *credulus error.*  
 Buch. xviii. 21. *credulus error.*  
 civ. 7. *At simul intonuit tua vox. —*  
 Buch. civ. 7. *At simul increpuit tua vox. —*  
 cxiii. 9. — *lætâ prole penates.*  
 Buch. xiii. 9. — *Lætâ renovat prole penates.*  
 cxiv. 1. *Cum domus Ifacidum.*  
 Buch. cxiv. 1. *Cum domus Ifacidum.*  
 cxv. 16. *Vota secundabit. —*  
 Buch. xx. 3. *Vota secundabit.*  
 cxix. 69. *legibus audiens.*  
 Buch. cxix. 100. *Huic quod audiam.‡*

—108,

\* So I think it should be read, not *olivæ*, as in all the Copies: For it is the *Tree*, not the *Oil*, that is green. Thus Virgil, *Æn.* v. 494. *Viridi Mnestheus evinctus olivâ.*

† Burman quarrels this Phrase; but I think without Reason.

‡ Burman doubts very much whether we can say *Audire alicui*: But

— 108, *Accipe sed facilis.*

Buch. in Dedic. *Accipe sed facilis.*

From these, and perhaps some other of the like kind, which I have overlook'd, it will I think appear pretty evident, that *Johnston* was so far from dreaming, and far more from *knowing*, as you affirm, Concluf. p. 48. that *Buchanan's Translation was very bad in every Sort of Poetry*; that on the contrary, he has (as he had declared on other Occasions) testified to the World the high Opinion he had of that Performance, when he was not ashamed to transcribe some Parts of it into his Paraphrase.

From these also, and what I have produced above, we see that Doctor *Johnston* was not more scrupulous than *Buchanan*, and indeed almost all other Poets, in borrowing Thoughts, Words, Phrases and Verses, from others before them. If this is a Fault, then all are equally involved in it, as I have shew'd above: But it is so far from being one, that it is not only allowable but praiseworthy.\* It is only then amiss, when such Borrowings are either too frequent, or not apposite to the Purpose the Author has in hand. The former cannot justly be objected to any of our Poets, and the latter much less to *Buchanan* than to Dr. *Johnston*.

I am, SIR, &c.

---

I have, I think, shew'd good Authority for it in my Grammar, Part ii. p. 143. Note 10.

\* For this (besides what I have said above) I have the Judgment of that great Italian Poet, and Instructor in Poetry, *Marc. Hieron. Vida*, who in his *Ars poetica*, lib. 3. among many other excellent Precepts to young Beginners, gives this:

*Ergo agite, o mecum securi accingite furtis  
Una omnes, pueri, passimque averitte pradam.*

And immediately adds,

*Infelix autem (quidam nam sepe reperti)  
Viribus ipse suis temere qui fesus & arti,  
Externa quasi opis nihil indigus, abnegat audax  
Fida sequi veterum vestigia, dum sibi pradā  
Temperat heu nimium, atque alienis parcere crevit,  
Vana superstitio!* —



## ERRATA.

- P**Age 2. Line 18. dele *it*.  
P. 12. L. penult, for *can-*  
*not*, read *can*.  
P. 18. L. 18. r. *Prayer*.  
P. 21. L. 4. r. *quem*.  
P. 24. L. 11. r. *cassus*.  
P. 89. L. 8. before *are*  
add *observes*.  
P. 92. L. 19. r. 54.  
P. 100. L. 21. after *ini-*  
*quis* put (?) and so in some  
other Places.  
P. 106. L. penult, for 90.  
r. 88.  
P. 135. L. 6. after *you*,  
add *otherwise*.  
P. 192. L. 1. before *to*,  
add *than*.  
P. 227. L. 9. r. *senarian*  
or *octonarian*.  
P. 230. L. 33. after *is*,  
add (*according to you*)  
P. 272. L. 14. for *it*, r.  
*them*.  
P. 288. L. 14. for *are*, r.  
*is*.  
P. 298. L. 1. before *to*  
add *are*.  
P. 305. L. penult, after  
*along* add *with*.  
P. 359. L. 3. before *them*  
add *of*.





\_\_\_\_\_

Д. Р. Я. Я.

*[The page contains faint, illegible markings and bleed-through from the reverse side.]*

1990